

JAN 29 1948

at THE
LONDON
QUARTERLY
AND
HOLBORN REVIEW

PERIODICAL ROOM
GENERAL LIBRARY
UNIV. OF MICH.

EDITOR: LESLIE F. CHURCH, B.A., Ph.D.

JANUARY 1948

Price 4s.

CONTENTS

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

EDITORIAL COMMENTS, by Leslie F. Church, B.A., Ph.D.

ARTICLES

Guilt, Psychology, and Religion, Leslie D. Weatherhead, M.A.

A Highland Heresy-Hunt, Geddes MacGregor, B.D., Ph.D.

D. H. Lawrence and the Revolt against Reason, W. S. Handley Jones

Education: Positive or Negative, T. B. Shepherd, M.A., Ph.D.

Frederick Denison Maurice, Tom Dring

Tomlinson of Mysore, N. Carr Sargent, B.A.

NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS

'The Bible Today' (C. H. Dodd), James Lewis

Did Shakespeare Read Aeschylus? T. Francis Glasson, M.A., D.D.

Church Union in North India, William Machin, M.A.

RECENT LITERATURE, Edited by C. Ryder Smith, B.A., D.D.

FROM MY NEW SHELF, C. Ryder Smith, B.A., D.D.

LONDON
EPWORTH PRESS
EDGAR C BARTON
25-35 CITY ROAD E.C.1

The London Quarterly and Holborn Review

LITERATURE HISTORY SOCIOLOGY
RELIGION THEOLOGY PHILOSOPHY

Editor: LESLIE F. CHURCH, B.A., Ph.D.

The London Quarterly and Holborn Review is published on the 25th of March, June, September, and December by the Epworth Press, 25-35 City Road, London, E.C.1. It may be obtained from the publishers or any bookseller and from all Methodist ministers at 4s. a copy (postage 3d.) or 15s. per annum, post free.

All contributions (typewritten, if possible), should be addressed to The Editor, 'The London Quarterly and Holborn Review', 25-35 City Road, E.C.1, with stamped addressed envelope for return in case of non-acceptance.

DEEDS—NOT WORDS!

To redress human wrong is a true knightly impulse. It was this impulse which led to the foundation of the National Children's Home 78 years ago, and it is still the inspiration of all its work.

Happily, the problem of children deprived of a normal home life is at last receiving the attention it deserves. But pity is not enough; something must be done to help these boys and girls—and somebody must do it.

The National Children's Home is playing its part, but it needs help—your help. Please be generous and send a gift to-day. Even the smallest contribution will be welcomed.

NATIONAL CHILDREN'S HOME
CHIEF OFFICES: Highbury Park, London, N5



Our Contributors

TOM DRING	Methodist Minister. Reviewer and contributor to literary publications.
T. FRANCIS GLASSON M.A., D.D.	Methodist Minister. Author of <i>The Second Advent</i> and <i>Thomas Glasson: Lay Preacher</i> .
W. S. HANDLEY JONES	Methodist Minister; poet, essayist, literary critic. Author of <i>The Unveiling and Other Poems</i> , <i>It Crossed my Mind</i> .
JAMES LEWIS	Methodist Minister. Authority on Indian Missions. Contributor to many reviews, magazines, etc. Author of <i>Lives of William Goudie</i> and <i>Francis Asbury</i> .
GEDDES MACGREGOR B.D., PH.D.	Lecturer in Philosophy, Edinburgh University. Studied at Heidelberg and the Sorbonne. One time Senior Assistant St. Giles's Cathedral, Edinburgh.
WILLIAM MACHIN M.A.	Methodist Missionary in Fyzabad, India. Translator of <i>Book of Offices</i> , <i>Ledrum's Outline of Christian Truth</i> into Urdu.
N. CARR SARGANT B.A.	Methodist Missionary in Mysore, India. Authority on Religions of India and the East.
T. B. SHEPHERD M.A., PH.D.	Senior Lecturer in Education at Westminster Training College. Author of <i>Living Education</i> , <i>Methodism and the Literature of the Eighteenth Century</i> .
C. RYDER SMITH B.A., D.D. (Lond.)	Principal, Richmond College, London University, 1929-40. Professor in Theology 1932-40. President Methodist Church, 1931. Author of many theological books.
LESLIE D. WEATHERHEAD M.A.	Minister of the City Temple Church, London. Author of <i>After Death</i> , <i>Psychology in Service of the Soul</i> , <i>Psychology and Religion</i> , <i>Jesus and Ourselves</i> , <i>Transforming Friendship</i> , etc.

The Significance of Thomas Coke

[In his admirable article on 'The Significance of Thomas Coke' in your issue for July 1947, the Rev. Cyril J. Davey says: 'Wales was without the Bible in the Welsh tongue' (p. 216), that is, during Dr. Coke's lifetime. This is a mistake, and a serious one. For the Welsh translation of the Bible by the Rev. William Morgan (afterwards Bishop of St. Asaph) was printed and published in London as far back as 1588, long before Thomas Coke was born at Brecon in 1747. Morgan's translation was revised in 1620, and that version is the one still used in all Welsh pulpits and among Welsh people generally: a version that anticipated the English Revised Version in many places.—D. TECWYN EVANS, M.A.].

Editorial Comments

THE BEGINNINGS OF A BASIC FAITH

A GREAT man has recently written a book which has been published by a great publishing house.¹ The author, Thomas W. Lamont, is distinguished as a statesman and financier. He is a philanthropist, a man of culture and intellectual eminence, and the successor of J. P. Morgan in the Morgan Bank.

There are two remarkable features about the publication of the book. In the first place it is not concerned with politics or high finance, but with 'the unexciting annals of a happy family'. The man of a thousand triumphs looks back to his boyhood in a Methodist manse and finds there the source of the faith and courage which has never failed him. It is a book of right values and tender thanksgiving. In the second place it has been published not because its subject was likely to ensure large sales, but because there are still those who realize that men need to be reminded of the incalculable wealth of such spiritual inheritance.

Tom Lamont was born in a little farmhouse at Claverack—or Clover Reach—near the Hudson River and the Catskill Mountains. His father was a Methodist minister, who accepted the traditional view of the itinerancy and moved every three years. Claverack, Catskill, Coxsackie, Saugerties, Rondout—in these places were the various manses where the boy's body was sheltered but, as one reads his book of memories, it is obvious that the 'parsonage' of which he writes is a house not built with hands; it is a 'moving tent' wherein the spirit of a little child grew toward manhood joyfully.

It was not that there was an oppressive air of conventional piety in the manse. Indeed had not the minister been a kind and tolerant man he would have resented the crudities of his flock, who granted him bookshelves with great reluctance, and insisted on periodical revival meetings conducted by all too-professional revivalists! At nine years of age Tom was 'converted'—or was he? Sometimes he wondered whether he was sufficiently convinced that he had 'led a sinful life'!

Looking back over the years, Thomas W. Lamont remembers his conclusion—he 'hated to do household chores, such as picking over the cinders and ashes from the sitting-room stove to salvage any unburned coals fallen through the grates; or drying the supper dishes; or, on a lovely spring Saturday morning, mucking over a pile of potatoes in the cellar to get the sprouts off. . . . If I had not been sinful I should have loved to do the chores!' So, with a smile, he remembers his attempts to fit himself into the strange theological pattern which neither his father nor his mother imposed upon him. Instead, he learned to accept the simple sincerity of their lives, unselfish and gay in the Spartan manse, and their gallant ministry of service to God and man. In maturity he passes his verdict on it all: 'It is true, too, that even if at that time I was barely old enough to know my own mind, yet those early associations, even the occasionally over-emotionalized meetings, all helped to give me a basic faith that I have been able to cling to ever since, no matter how far I may have strayed from some of the simple beliefs of my childhood.'

As the story unfolds one realizes it is an unconscious sermon on the text

¹ *My Boyhood in a Parsonage*, by Thomas W. Lamont. Heinemann, 12s. 6d.

'Love never fails'. On second thoughts 'sermon' is not the best word, for in its way, it is a poem, as whimsical and real, as intimate and tender, as if it had been Sir James Barrie telling us about Thrums and his ain folk.

What did it matter that only Presbyterians had bath-rooms? There was a tin tub in the manse! Why should one grumble that father 'gave the first tenth of his income to the Lord'? Mother and he spent the meagre balance on living, educating the children, and on books. By miracles that only mothers can work the family was fed. The children went to school and to college, but they had already learned how and what to read. They had learned something even more important for love begets love, and when Tom, at school, wrote to the manse, rather wistfully, about going to the Andover football match, the loved ones at the manse sent him the necessary dollar. He was uncomfortable in the knowledge that he had hinted at such a sacrifice and presently found spare-time work, chopping wood at fifteen cents an hour. The manse funds were replenished—and the minister's boy was the happier.

Some little time ago a group of distinguished people tried to discover whether any one English county had produced more famous men than the rest. Quite unexpectedly one of the number remarked casually that he could find no geographical valuation, but that it was obvious that the manse, with its 'plain living and high thinking' had given the world more than its quota of strong characters with qualities of leadership. Coming from an agnostic and a cynic, it was a striking testimony to the ultimate value of the Christian home. In the simple but beautifully recorded childhood of Tom Lamont there is confirmation of the verdict. It is not a geographical or physical circumstance which is the all-important factor. Like begets like, and the faith and love of Christian parents goes a long way toward establishing the faith which abides when the child has grown into the man, and the little parish has become the battle-field of the world. The children of the manse in the Hudson River Valley were themselves the proof of the value of the seed-plot.

When Hammond Lamont, the eldest son, died, an eloquent tribute was paid to him in the columns of the New York *Evening Post*, in which the following passage occurs: 'In politics, in morals, in that mystery and awe of existence which we call religion, his active mind had sought out fact and built up conviction. And his intellectual honesty was so complete, his detection of fallacy and delusion so instant, his hatred of sham and lies so absolute, that for him the discovery of truth was the same thing as embracing it, his translation of thought into motive and action being instinctive and instantaneous.'

At Harvard, Thomas had the opportunity of hearing John Fiske, W. W. Goodwin, Francis James Child, Phillips Brooks, George Herbert Palmer, Josiah Royce, and William James. As he benefited by their lectures he remembered the manse where his father had given him a grounding in Latin and English, and read from a precious Greek Testament each morning at family prayers, and where a mother had offered him pure gold, not in dollar currency, but in affection and understanding. 'The parsonage, when I went home, was just as much a haven of rest as ever,' he says as he thinks of Harvard days. 'I was always happy to get home, even though the simplicity of boyhood days had gone a bit.'

Here in this moving book, is the story of the boyhood of a great and modest

man, and in the home he describes one may find the beginnings of the basic faith of a great philanthropist—one who is still a lover of his fellow-men, in this tormented world.

THE WITNESS OF A REVOLUTIONARY CHURCH

The statements issued by the Committee of the International Missionary Council held at Whitby, Ontario, have been published under the title *The Witness of a Revolutionary Church*.² They are of universal importance since they are the findings of the first representative meeting of the Council held since the war. The booklet gives a preliminary account of the deliberations which will be more fully expounded in a book to be written by Professor Latourette and Mr. Richey Hogg. In so far as they define the central purpose of the Church's mission to this new post-war world they are a most valuable supplement to the conclusions of the Madras Council in 1938. Those present at Whitby feel that its influence may be felt in the development of 'missionary strategy' in the immediate future.

This condensed report is divided into four sections. The first deals with *Christian Witness in a Revolutionary World*. The war changed many things, and destroyed age-old institutions, but it failed to obliterate the Church. In some countries people learned to pray with new understanding and deeper faith. The spiritual unity of the Body of Christ defied the harsh necessities of war, and today the old fellowships appear to be stronger than ever before. Though the dark years have taken their toll it is astonishing how small a number of Christians renounced their faith. There is war-weariness all over the world, and the Churches are feeling the effect of the long strain and, in some cases, of severe persecution. Fears of new wars, and the uncertainties of the present uneasy peace have brought renewed anxieties to many people. The shortage of well-informed Christian leaders has been increased because for at least seven years there has been little or no theological training. The Christian ministry is depleted, and its newest recruits almost untrained. Those who looked for a sudden revival of religion have been disappointed, and are being compelled to take a realistic view of a world in which anti-Christian forces seem to grow stronger every day. As the Council considered these and other factors, they still came to the conclusion: 'There are signs everywhere that God is at work, but there are many adversaries, and what can be seen is rather the promise of the revival which may be granted by God's grace to a Church which is faithful to Him than the reality of revival today.'

In this first section the report also deals with *The World which Confronts the Church*. The aftermath of war shows great nations 'suffering the spiritual agonies of defeat. . . . Over immense areas the problem is that of sheer survival. Starvation—malnutrition—mental and spiritual, a legacy of psychological instability—such were the words which emerged in the diagnosis of the present situation.' Political systems have broken down and physical, moral, and spiritual values have deteriorated. We are living in a 'secular' world, with a new and more virulent nationalism arising. The decay of Western civilization is held by many to include the failure of the Christian Church. Totalitarianism

² *The Witness of a Revolutionary Church*. International Missionary Council, 2 Eaton Gate, London, S.W.1. Price, 9d.

appears as 'militant Communism, resurgent Islam, or political Roman Catholicism'. It is a world in which terrorism increases, and selfishness and intolerance provide a soil in which antagonisms grow quickly.

Grim as is the situation, the Church is called to meet it in the power of the Word. The lordship of Christ involves a new fellowship which can break down all barriers and resolve all hatreds. It implies a new quality of living, and a clear theological interpretation of the Gospel itself.

The need is obvious and desperately urgent, but world evangelization can only be accomplished if there be a real partnership between the Older and the Younger Christian Churches. The crisis calls for united action, a great increase in the number of missionary workers, a development of equipment and a complete dedication of the individual and the whole Church.

In its second section, the report considers the relation of the Older and Younger Churches, under the title *Partners in Obedience*. It advocates self-governing and self-propagating churches as soon as possible, insisting that leadership in the Younger Churches must pass from the missionary to leaders in the local Christian community. There must be a partnership in personnel, in finance, in policy, and in administration. In this part of the deliberations one might have expected a cleavage, but, though the representatives of the Older and of the Younger Churches met, at first, separately there was not a single major difference of opinion when their recommendations were considered by the whole Council. The two statements were combined, revised, and accepted. As one reads the report in detail, one is impressed with this unity of opinion on such controversial subjects. In itself it gives one new hope for the whole Church.

The third section—*The Supranationality of Missions*—is the development of meetings held by European missionary leaders at Rheinfelden and Baarn in the spring of 1947. It affirms that, in spite of current attempts to establish a new cult of the State, 'our primary loyalty is to Christ and our responsibility as servants of the ecumenical Church must dominate our whole thinking and behaviour'.

So the report comes to its close, in defining the Functions of the *International Missionary Council*. It exists to encourage expectant evangelism by studying present problems and opportunities, by co-ordinating effort, by deepening universal fellowship, and by striving to create a public opinion which shall preserve and develop religious freedom.

The statement is an inspiring document which gives the Christian new ground for hope, and clear direction for his future efforts. It is to be hoped that the present difficulties in the publishing world will not unduly delay the larger book, for this is a matter of supreme urgency. In the words of the Council, we too, are 'convinced that the source of the world's sorrow is spiritual, and that its healing must be spiritual, through the entry of the risen Christ into every part of the life of the world'.

INTERNATIONAL MISSIONARY COUNCIL

The International Missionary Council announces the appointment of the Rev. John A. Mackay, D.D., as its Chairman in succession to Bishop James

Chamberlain Baker. Dr. Mackay, who is the President of Princeton (Presbyterian) Theological Seminary, New Jersey, U.S.A., will assume the I.M.C. Chairmanship on 1st January 1948.

Dr. Mackay was born in Inverness in 1889 and graduated from the University of Aberdeen in 1912 with First Class Honours in Philosophy. He subsequently studied Theology in Princeton Theological Seminary. He travelled in Spain and studied at the University of Madrid in preparation for a missionary career in Latin America, and in 1916, went with Mrs. Mackay to Peru as an educational missionary of the Free Church of Scotland. He received the degree of Litt.D. from the National University of Peru two years later and held for a time the Chair of Metaphysics there. He founded the Anglo-Peruvian College, which is now one of the leading Protestant institutions in Latin America. From 1925-32 Dr. Mackay travelled and lectured extensively in the Latin American Republics, particularly in the universities, for the South American Federation of the Young Men's Christian Association.

In 1932 Dr. Mackay was appointed Secretary of the Presbyterian Board of Foreign Missions, U.S.A., and since 1945 has been its President.

Dr. Mackay attended the Jerusalem meeting of the International Missionary Council in 1928 and the Oxford Conference on Church, Community, and State in 1937, where he served as Chairman of the Commission on the Universal Church and the World of Nations. He is a member of the Provisional Committee of the World Council of Churches.

Dr. Mackay holds a number of honorary degrees from American and other Universities, including the University of Debrecen, Hungary. He studied also in the University of Bonn, Germany, in 1930.

He is the author of a number of books in Spanish and English and is the Editor of *Theology Today*, a leading American Theological journal.

RELIGION IN POLAND TODAY

The Polish people, stricken so grievously by war, remain, at heart, religious. The Roman Catholic Church has always been by far the strongest religious body in the country, and the demonstrative Poles have always responded to its continual appeal. During the war many of its priests and bishops were murdered and Cardinal Hlond was, for some time, a prisoner. More than five million Poles were done to death in concentration camps, and history has no chapter more dreadful than that which records the wholesale massacres in the Ghetto in Warsaw. In conversation with the late Chief Rabbi, Dr. Hertz, we heard his words, spoken under great emotional stress: 'You will not read the full story for twenty-five years, and then you will be ashamed that, at the time, you underestimated our sufferings so tragically.'

Though the focus of this policy of extermination was undoubtedly fixed upon the Jewish people, the Christian communities did not escape. In one Roman Catholic diocese 50 per cent of the priests were killed. In his recent visit to Poland, Cardinal Griffin describes his visit to a Jesuit school in Warsaw, where, 'in the cellar of the house there rested the bodies of twenty-five Jesuit priests and some prominent lay people who were shot by the Nazis during the occupation'. He returned to England, impressed by the enormous losses

inflicted on the Poles, by their present poverty, and by 'the strength and virility of Catholic life in Poland'.

Though the Polish Protestants are numerically in the minority, they represent a section of the nation which has witnessed a good confession, through the agonies of Poland's many martyrdoms.

The Evangelical-Lutheran Church is the most numerous of all Protestant Churches in Poland. It numbers 100,000 members and belongs to the Lutheran World Council in the United States and to the World Council of Churches. The consistory of this Church is in Warsaw and its head is Bishop Jan Szeruda.

The Evangelical-Calvinist Church, with a consistory at Lodz, numbers only 2,000 members. Its superintendent is Rev. Stanislaw Skierski.

The Methodist Church numbers 50,000 members and is a mission branch of the American Methodist Church, enjoying full autonomy in Poland. The Church is also a member of the World Council of Churches and its Superintendent is Dr. Konstanty Najder.

The Polish National Catholic Church has 30,000 members. It is independent, although connected with the Polish National Church in the United States, whose head is Dr. Hodur, and whose headquarters are at Scranton, Pennsylvania. The Polish branch is directed by the Council of the National Church, with Bishop Jozef Padewski at its head.

The Baptist Church numbers 10,000 members. It is a member of the World Baptist Council in America and of the World Council of Churches. Its headquarters are in Warsaw and the President of the Council is Alexander Kirson.

The Union of Adventists, with headquarters at Cracow, numbers 5,000 members. Jan Kulak is the President of the Council.

Apart from these Protestant Churches, there are some small religious groups which do not enjoy official standing, but can pursue their activities if they have obtained special permission.

It is unfortunate that public opinion in Britain is so often influenced by slight experience of contacts with a few scattered groups, rather than by an adequate knowledge of the Polish people. Popular verdicts are frequently based on insufficient evidence, and it cannot be too strongly urged upon religious and political leaders that they make themselves familiar with the efforts of a gallant people, devoting themselves to the reconstruction of their national life. Two sources of current news are available: The Information Department, Polish Embassy, 47 Portland Place, London, W.1, and the British-Polish Society, 72-8 Fleet Street, London, E.C.4. In this critical hour it is the informed person who alone has the right to be enthusiastic.

A PLEA FOR ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION AND WORLD PEACE

A noteworthy appeal was recently broadcast by His Excellency the President of the Argentine Republic. In it he stated what is described by the Argentine representatives in this country as the 'pacifist and humanitarian feelings' of their Government and of the people as a whole.

In the course of his speech General Juan Perón said: 'The spiritual and material forces of Argentina are mobilized today to make known to the people

of the world the fervent desire of our country to aid humanity in the fulfilment of its aspiration for internal and international peace. . . . Argentina wishes to place herself, through the awakening of her civic conscience, in a position from which she can help to achieve this universal desire. She longs to contribute something toward the surmounting of the artificial obstacles created by man, to put an end to the sufferings of the destitute, and to ensure that the spirit and the deeds of our country may always serve the forces of good in the struggle to overcome the forces of evil.'

The President declared that the policy and social programme of Argentina were designed to help in the building of 'a world in which the characteristics of crude exploitation, destruction and hatred, and social injustice should be forever banished'.

Argentina and America seek intimate and intelligent fellowship with the rest of the suffering world for, as the President pointed out, the motto of the crusade must be 'Solidarity'.

'The rhythm of difficulties is becoming accentuated.' War and misunderstanding produce chaos and confusion and the only cure for such conditions is a peaceful attempt to understand one another. International peace—the great problem of mankind—'will only be possible after internal peace has been established and consolidated in all nations, and one of the means of attaining this objective is the cultivation of respect for the free will of peoples'.

In recognizing the right of war-torn countries to higher standards of living and to economic prosperity, President Perón said that his people sought means to co-operate 'with the utmost generosity'. The misery of such peoples must be ended, but help must not be mistaken for charity.

'Want and abundance, peace and war, can no longer be co-existent factors in the world.' The resources of Argentina must be used 'to achieve the moral and spiritual rehabilitation of Europe. . . . All our energies are at the service of Peace.' In his powerful appeal he affirmed the need for respecting the sovereignty of nations, for affording economic aid to countries in distress, and for a closely co-ordinated spiritual and material effort on the part of all people everywhere.

In such a programme he placed first the need for the spiritual disarmament of humanity. Everyone who loves peace—men, women, and children—must organize themselves 'to do away with the war psychosis, and to eliminate the factions which divide us and which prepare for war'.

'Internally, capitalistic and totalitarian extremes, whether of the right or left, must be eradicated, and collaboration must be substituted for the old system of struggle.' Antagonistic ideologies must be abandoned, and a world conscience—putting man above systems or ideologies—created.

President Perón concluded his memorable speech by a passionate assertion that 'humanity can only be saved by constructive peace, never by struggles which destroy material, spiritual, and moral values'.

We are indebted to Celestino Espina and Angel P. Bottegoni of the Argentine Embassy for details of a pronouncement and appeal which is a welcome antidote to some of the depressing reports of protracted negotiations for the resettlement of Europe.

LESLIE F. CHURCH

Articles

GUILT, PSYCHOLOGY, AND RELIGION

I—THE ORIGIN OF GUILT

IN ALL psychotherapeutic practice it is found that the sense of guilt plays a large part. Sometimes, indeed, guilt, either conscious or repressed, is a determining factor in neurosis, and in the writer's own experience, a sense of guilt has frequently been responsible for the onset of serious physical symptoms. We remember how the removal of the sense of guilt brought the immediate cure of physical symptoms in one of the miracles of our Lord. Guilt, then, is a subject of immense importance as we view the *rapprochement* of psychology and religion.

Why do we feel a sense of guilt? In childhood we find that there are certain things which get us into trouble. We have to bow before our parents' and teachers' conception of what is right and what is wrong, however arbitrary and confused their sense of ethics may be.

It may be that this sense of right and wrong and the development of conscience goes much farther back. Jung comes forward with his theory of the collective unconscious and tells us that the racial archetypes play an important part in the development of that fear which follows doing wrong and the joy which follows doing right. Stealing, for example, from the beginning of time, has brought punishment from the tribe if the theft were discovered. 'Stealing doesn't pay.' 'You will get into trouble if you are caught.' This sort of thought is as deep in the human mind as any idea can be, and, apart from our parents, it seems to me more than probable that a sense of guilt would, in many minds, follow stealing, even without the training of the parent, though some Indian children I knew in earlier days seemed to have no clear sense that stealing was wrong or why it was called wrong. Some 'sins', however, seem to be universally perceptible as 'wrong' without our being told so. The universe seems built on a plan which is hostile to some forms of evil.¹

From our parents and teachers then, and perhaps from the collective unconscious, we build up a 'super-ego'. It is a self which demands from man a certain moral standard imposed through fear, not through dispassionate choice. The source of the authority remains unconscious. At its bidding I do not act because it demands an ideal which I have freely chosen and to which I desire to attain for its own sake. This is the ego-ideal at whose behest we say not only 'I ought', but, 'I want to'. I respond to the super-ego through fear of the consequences of doing anything else. It whispers not, 'Freely choose this path, for you can see it to be the way of self-fulfilment'; it whispers: 'A person who aspires to be this, pretends to be that, has been trusted with this position, is assumed by the crowd to be so and so, *must*, at least as far as public knowledge

¹ Jung would have enjoyed the story of the little boy interrupted in the act of stealing sweets by a loud clap of thunder. Turning to the sky and shaking his fist at it, he muttered: 'You big bully!'

goes, attain to a certain moral standard, do this and that, play such-and-such a part.' The 'id', the fundamental, primitive savage in us all will violently oppose the demands of the super-ego and unless a path of compromise can be found, an ego-ideal which gives us a way of life satisfying to both super-ego and id, then neurosis is inevitable. The conflict between the super-ego and the id has been the cause of many a 'nervous-breakdown'. Such a compromise, so far from being a weak surrender, is the discovery of a positive path of life which may take years to find and follow. It will not be a path of impossible achievement, remote from, and denying the existence of, all instinctive urges, such as the inflated super-ego sometimes demands.² It will not, on the other hand, be a complete capitulation to the unleashed, unrestrained cravings of instinctive desire. It will be a path that pays tribute both to the real needs of the 'id' (for the id is not immoral but amoral), and the lofty demands of a super-ego *which has been seen through* and which is no longer the lair of *unconscious* complexes.

Illustrations of this super-ego are seen through every age and phase of life: in the child who is told he must do this and that because he is 'mummy's good boy' and who has been known to stand himself in the corner because he has fallen below the standard imposed by his mother and through fear of her reaction if he fails. It is seen in the prig who is a parson's son at school, and can't forget it, torn constantly between parsonic and schoolboy standards; in the parson himself who can never forget his profession, wears a clerical collar under all circumstances and can never 'come off it'. These are amusing enough. But the super-ego can be a grim tyrant and when men act through an 'oughtness' not of free choice, but because of fear, a fear often arising from unconscious complexes, a fear of falling below a standard imposed by others, we know them to be in its grip. Defiance of the moral compulsions of the super-ego is the main cause of pathological and exaggerated guilt.

The trouble is that whatever may be the origin of conscience, we 'introject' into our own natures, to use Freud's word, the factors by which the super-ego is built up.³ We 'take them into ourselves'. From the depths of the unconscious they sway us. Many people, long after reaching adult age, react to certain situations according to the drive of the moral teaching of their parents, and indeed to the super-egos of their parents. In my own case, for example, however I might defend intellectually the moral value of any particular film, to see it in a cinema on a *Sunday* evening would induce such guilt feelings as would make it impossible for me to enjoy the film. A friend of mine regularly attends church every Sunday morning, escaping with immense relief as soon as the service is over and never giving a thought to religion at any other time in the week. His super-ego demands this from him at sixty as powerfully as his parents demanded it from him at sixteen. His parents' demands were introjected into him and now are built into his super-ego, where unconsciously they sway his behaviour. The fact that they are unconscious is revealed by the rationalizations he makes if teased about his church-going. He rarely goes to church on holidays, but if he absented himself while in town, his super-ego

² Some will say: 'Surely we cannot set our standard too high!' But in effect one can if the 'height' ignores other factors in the situation. So an athlete can over-train and break down. So a pupil can attempt the impossible examination and break down. Other elements in our make-up demand to be heard and they are not necessarily 'lower' elements.

³ Freud, *The Ego and the Id*, p. 47.

would punish him with feelings of guilt, though the action it drives him to do, Sunday after Sunday, is only a species of moral bluff. At the same time, he extracts from this weekly farce a sense of complacent well-being instead of guilty shame. He has appeased the gods, and so to dinner, sleep, and—what he really *wants* to do. Similarly, a woman of my acquaintance defied her parents and took up a profession although her parents wished her to stay at home. Although she did remarkably well, every new achievement was the occasion of deep depression and feelings of guilt even after her parents were dead. The power of the super-ego is repressed into the unconscious. She did not know—until analysis revealed it—why to pass a new examination brought depression. But she then realized the influence of a super-ego saying in terms of depression: 'You ought not to have gone along a path of which your parents disapproved.'

We see, then, how feelings of guilt can be experienced apart from any conscious wrong-doing. The enormous and oppressive sense of guilt in regard to sex must be mentioned here. Many adult people feel it is wicked to talk about it or even to know about it, and only those of us who have dealt with large numbers of people know how exaggerated can be the sense of guilt which the almost universal⁴ habit of masturbation can bring to those whose super-ego has been built up and inflated by the false attitude of the Victorians and by the taboo⁵ on sex, to break which can make many a sensitive modern as miserable as the breaking of a tribal taboo made the savage. For the savage, the punishment of the tribe, often in terms of physical pain, made him miserable. For the modern, the punishment of the outraged super-ego in terms of neurosis has a similar effect. The super-ego, indeed, acts much as the taboo. Both produce a compulsion which the victim inwardly wishes he could resist, but to which he capitulates through fear. An 'oughtness' is produced which does not win free co-operation, which, in fact, produces acute conflict, but which cannot be withstood without fear of punishment or evil consequence.

In speaking of the origin of a sense of guilt, we must note that the mechanism of the 'association of ideas' often sets up intense feelings of guilt. It is not a new origin. It derives from a 'sin' committed, but repressed and forgotten. Yet, if one may put it thus, the unconscious remembers it and if a situation or setting is repeated in real life which 'reminds' the unconscious of the earlier guilty occasion, the unconscious either discharges into consciousness a disturbing sense of guilt, or creates a mental or physical symptom, which *apparently* has no relation to any guilty incident, but which psychological investigation reveals as directly attributable to guilt.

One case of obsessional neurosis I studied some years ago is a case in point. The patient could never remember a certain name though it was a common one, because it was unconsciously associated in his mind with a discreditable adventure which he wanted to forget.

Another most fascinating case I was able to remedy concerned a young married woman, who lived in the country and who developed a rash across

⁴ Ninety-nine per cent. in males and over ninety per cent. in females, at some period between 15 and 50.

⁵ Flugel defines 'taboo' as 'a prohibition that carries a supernatural or a social sanction'; *Man, Morals, and Society*, p. 123 (Duckworth 1945). A taboo, he comments later (p. 132) 'is revealed as a prohibition of a desire', and again (p. 125): 'taboos are the socialized expressions of conflicts.'

her chest when she went shopping in the town. The strange feature was that even a shopping expedition in the town did not *always* produce the rash. To make a very long story very short, it emerged that she only developed the rash if, while shopping in the town, she saw a certain kind of motor car. Without the 'why' of it coming into consciousness at all, to see a certain type of car reminded the unconscious, in which, of course, *all* our memories are stored, of immoral incidents which had happened, in the back of a similar car, with a married man while her own husband was fighting overseas. The guilt was repressed, but had its revenge in the unsightly rash, making a person who would not face up to, and accept the fact of, a stained mind, compulsorily bear the stigma of a stained body. Subsequent to interviews with me, the patient promised to have no more dealings with her illicit lover. She realized the fact of the forgiveness of God, of which I shall write later, she and her husband—who was told the whole story by his wife—reaffirmed their marriage vows together in my presence, and a stubborn rash, into which many ointments had been well rubbed, disappeared, and has never returned, though I am writing five years after the incidents described.

II—THE EFFECT OF GUILT

We have seen, then, that for all men, arising from a sense of having consciously done wrong, or arising from the tyranny of the super-ego, built up as it is from the training of parents, and teachers, from *their* super-egos and from those of *their* ancestors, from events and situations associated with those in which guilt was normally incurred, from the breaking of some taboo or other, man universally experiences a sense of guilt.

What is its effect upon him?

Its effect is of two kinds: 1. If he consciously accepts the fact of guilt, the effect is depression, and if he be spiritually sensitive and introspective, it may well bow him down in despair. 'O wretched man that I am,' he cries with Paul, 'who shall deliver me from this body of death?'* The sense of guilt seems as intolerable as the corpse strapped to the body of a prisoner by a terrible Roman custom. Wherever he went, he could not escape the stench and disgusting burden of it all. 2. If, on the other hand, the patient successfully represses guilt, pretends it isn't there, 'gets over it', banishes it into the unconscious, it may, from those inaccessible depths, set up a physical illness, hard for his physician to understand and harder still to cure. When the burden of the mind, conscious or unconscious, becomes intolerable, it pushes it on to the body (to use a convenient phrase), translating its disharmony into some physical symptom which lightens that mental burden and brings to a patient who knows (if only unconsciously) that he is a guilty man who ought to be punished and lose the love of his fellows, the love and sympathy more readily evoked if the patient is 'ill'. ('I'm ill, you can't be unkind to me.')

It is better if a man accepts his guilt as his due, provided it follows 'sin' and is not merely the torture of an inflated super-ego. It is better that it should depress his conscious mind than poison the unconscious, for the unconscious

* Romans 7²⁴.

will, in the end, indubitably send in some kind of bill which will have to be paid.

If he does 'feel' consciously a sense of guilt, we notice another effect it has upon him. *He wants to put things right.* He may try to do so by rationalizing. He tells himself that his sin is no worse than others have committed, that he was provoked, that it was 'justified' in business deals. He may blame others in order to escape the tension of guilt. But the fact remains, he feels there is something to be done. Even though the sin may never, perhaps can never, be found out, yet within himself something must be put right. This universal fact is one to which many psychologists should pay heed. Its significance and importance to the patient have often been overlooked.

In some cases this 'putting right' can be done in part. At the worst I can confess my sin to the one I have wronged. Sometimes I can do better and make restitution. If I steal from another or from the Income Tax Commissioners, I can at least pay back. But even then something remains. My friend, let us say, from whom I stole five pounds, has been paid his money, but a sense of guilt remains. I remain not quite the same person as before. I am now the kind of person capable of stealing five pounds. Character deterioration has revealed itself. I have made remuneration, but I still feel guilty. A court of law appreciates the fact that confessing and paying back do not put things right. Punishment follows the most abject confession.

So we come to that effect of guilt which we can only call the desire for punishment. The feeling, 'I ought to be punished', remains even when as complete a restitution as I can make has been made. To ease this tension men have resorted to penance; they have fasted and prayed, they have tried to make atonement by this sacrifice and that. When they were little boys and stole a schoolmate's penknife, not only did they have to restore the knife, they suffered a whipping also. *Then*, and then only, did the tension of guilt disappear. Men still feel the *need* of the whipping-equivalent which, though painful, eased the tension of guilt. Yet, now they are grown up, they cannot find a way of dispersing the sense of guilt.

Here we come on a new cause of psychogenic illness. Again and again, in my experience, the chronic headache or neuralgic pain is the punishment which the super-ego inflicts on the ego which *desires* punishment, even while it hates it, just as the child desires to end guilt-tension, but hates the pain of the punishment. I am not, of course, suggesting that anything like all chronic illness can thus be interpreted. That would be a gross distortion of my meaning, but I am saying that I have met it often enough to mention it in this connexion. We so associated punishment with guilt in our childhood and reacted to it with both the desire for it and the desire to escape it, that we repeat this reaction in adult life, and the super-ego, taking its familiar role of parent-substitute, inflicts it upon us, and though we hate it and call in the doctor to cure our pain, yet our deep mind accepts it as preferable to the unrelieved tension of guilt.

Flugel, in his excellent book, *Man, Morals, and Society*, says that so deep in man is his need of punishment that even if things go well, he feels uneasy. Knowing that we do not deserve it, we become restive if our need for punishment is not met. *Hubris*, or arrogance, is so often the prelude of disaster that we fear when we have an unbroken run of what the world calls success.

Strangely enough, while I was writing this section I called upon a minister who had recently passed through a most trying experience. To my amazement, he said it was almost a relief! 'Why?' I asked, incredulously. 'Well,' he said, 'for thirty years I have visited people in their times of suffering, and I have wondered why I was exempt. I had never suffered any physical or mental pain and I knew I did not deserve this. My present suffering has eased that situation considerably.'

We are right in regarding this as abnormal, but it is common⁷ and Flugel has called it the Polycrates complex. Polycrates, according to Herodotus, was a tyrant in Samos whose every enterprise was successful. His friends became alarmed and advised him to make some offering to the gods in a form which cost him something. In response to their advice, he threw a valuable ring into the sea. But when a magnificent fish, caught off the coast, was presented to him because it was such a fine specimen, his cook found the ring inside it. This was interpreted to mean that his offering was rejected; that the gods were not going to be bought off by a ring from demanding their penalties. The incident set up such a terror that a terrible calamity was impending that certain of his allies deserted him. He was obviously a doomed man!

Any close observer of human life must have noticed, in antithesis to this, that illness of body or mind frequently happens just when a person has at last got rid of an obstacle to long-sought success and happiness. A woman nurse had her professional work interrupted by the demand that she should stay at home to nurse an aged and only parent. She carried out the task without outward complaint, but as soon as the parent died, she herself fell ill with neurosis. Was it the strain of the illness, as the doctor said, or was it the 'need for punishment' to ease the tension of the guilt of repressed hate, over a long period, of a person who had frustrated her ambitions; a conflict between the super-ego and the id, the super-ego saying: 'You ought to be punished for hating a loving parent. It isn't done, and, if you hate, without admitting it or showing it, you will be made to suffer.'

A young minister was appointed to one of the best pulpits in America and 'broke down' after six months. Was it the strain of his great burden, or was it the punishment of one who inwardly knew that he was quite unfitted to stand in such spiritual pre-eminence above his far worthier fellow ministers. Did the super-ego, as it were, say: 'You are guilty of this and this and that. You have never paid for these sins. But if you think that a rotter like you is going to stand up there, as if he were a paragon of all the virtues, and get away with it, you will find punishment awaiting you. The "id" is not prepared for you to pretend to that high level and between us we will pull you down.' Flugel points out,⁸ in support of this theme, that in certain cases where neurosis is attributable to what we have called the need for punishment, a severe accident causes the neurosis to clear up. The mechanism seems to be: 'I ought to suffer and, in lieu of physical pain (whipping-substitute), I must suffer mentally (neurosis). Since this accident has brought me physical pain, there is no further need for me to suffer any more mental pain.' The super-ego again hands over its duties to the body.

⁷ Note the way some people, after a long spell of good health, fine weather, or a run of good luck in business, say, 'I shall have to pay for this'.

⁸ *op. cit.*, p. 156, where illustrations are given by this very able writer.

III—CAN GUILT BE DEALT WITH?

If all this be true, we can understand how avidly man has sought, in the ritual of religion, some way of disposing of guilt, of ending the tension which guilt sets up, of satisfying his 'need for punishment' and, at the same time, of escaping punishment.

No wonder the Jews hit on the ideas of the scapegoat, the sin offering, the vicarious sufferer, and so on. If man could really believe that guilt was thus dealt with, the problem was solved. Yet the great spirits, even within a system that sought to inculcate such a belief, were in doubt of its efficacy. 'Will the Lord be pleased with thousands of rams or with ten thousand rivers of oil? Shall I give my firstborn for my transgression, the fruit of my body for the sin of my soul?'

No wonder that the doctrine of the Atonement had, and in many places still has, the interpretation to which the scapegoat idea is the clue.

*I lay my sins on Jesus,
The spotless Lamb of God.
He bears them all and frees us
From the accursed load.¹⁰*

So runs a hymn still sung:

*Not all the blood of beasts
On Jewish altars slain
Can give the guilty conscience peace
Or wash away our stain.*

*But Christ, the heavenly Lamb,
Takes all our sins away;
A sacrifice of nobler name,
And richer blood, than they.¹¹*

Further quotation is unnecessary. The idea is deeply imbedded in Christian theology, and is held by many devout people, even in this modern age.

I wish here to write with great reverence and with immense respect for the feelings of others. I also wish to express the truth as I see it. The relevant truth here, as I see it, can be expressed in one sentence of immense importance. It is this: *Guilt cannot be transferred.*

If I have committed sin, then, if it really is sin, by which I mean the conscious choice of known evil, nothing can alter the fact that *I* have done it, and it is a fictitious juggling with words to suppose that I can lay the guilt on anyone else. No one else can bear my *guilt*, i.e. become the blameworthy person. Many theories of the atonement which have bemused men's minds stand condemned because that great psychological fact that guilt cannot be transferred, has been overlooked or denied.

Then, can nothing be done about guilt? If not, then the patient whose neurosis is due to guilt cannot be adequately cured. The answer, to my mind, is that very much can be done through a religious experience, but nothing can

¹⁰ Micah 6 7. ¹¹ *M.H.B.*, No. 881 (1903 Edition). ¹¹ *M.H.B.*, No. 234 (1933 Edition).

be done here by psychological treatment. That is no disparagement of the latter. It is often necessary in getting the memory of sin to consciousness, in determining just how sinful it is,¹² in sorting out the guilt-feelings set up by sin and those set up by the super-ego.

But when the psychologist has laid bare the fact of sin in the experience of the patient, he, *quâd* psychologist, is silent. What can be done next? A spiritual adviser who tells the patient that Christ bears his guilt, is, in my view, giving faulty advice, which tends to make the patient's 'religious' experience neurotic. He will run away from the situation, 'hide in the wounds of Christ', as some have put it, just at a time when he is in sight of health.

The liberating word here is forgiveness. This never means the cancelling of consequence. The consequences of sin follow us whether we are forgiven or not, and man's 'need for punishment' is satisfied. But the consequences of sin are changed by forgiveness from being the soulless nemesis of a blind system, to being the friendly discipline of a loving Father, and, though grievous, can be welcomed, because *through* the discipline, the sufferer is becoming what his Father wishes him to be and what, in his new moment of insight, he himself wishes to be.

The central idea of forgiveness is that it means the restoration of a Father-son relationship which sin had broken. Whatever consequences may follow, the *relationship* is as though it never had been broken. The prodigal may be convalescent for a long time after his experience in the far country, but now he is at home with exactly the same status of son-ship as before he went away.

If only the patient can be made to realize this (and he must go on until he does realize it emotionally; to be told about it does little but pave the way for emotional realization), then the therapeutic results are immense. In fact, after studying, and in a small way practising, the bearing of religion on psycho-neurotic conditions for a quarter of a century, I give as my own conclusion the view that the idea of the forgiveness of God is the most powerful therapeutic idea in the world. So many neuroses go back to guilt, conscious or repressed. The idea that sin is forgiven, that the relationship with God which was broken by it is now entirely restored, that it will be 'remembered no more for ever', is 'behind God's back', is as far from the sinner as east from west; this idea, I say, once really received by the mind, is like the dawn breaking after a long night of black torture, and I have frequently known severe physical illness clear up speedily when it has been grasped by the feelings as well as by the intellect; when the patient *feels* forgiven as well as knowing the fact that God forgives. In the cases of illness in which guilt is the causal factor, men who really hear the liberating word, 'Thy sins are forgiven thee', very speedily take up their beds and walk.

This is not the place in which to try to explain fully the part played by the doctrine of the Atonement in this matter. I have done this elsewhere.¹³ Suffice it to say here that I regard it as a crude and mistaken interpretation to imagine that the death of Christ mechanically removes man's guilt; that man can, with any reality, 'lay his sins on Jesus' in the sense in which the devout Jew laid

¹² I entirely agree with Dr. J. A. Hadfield's distinction between sin and moral disease. See his *Psychology and Morals* (Methuen).

¹³ *A Plain Man Looks at the Cross* (Independent Press 1945).

them on an animal, whether scapegoat or Temple sacrifice. The heart of the matter, to me, is that our Lord identifies Himself with us, guilty as we are, in some such way as we would stand by a loved one who sinned, whatever he did, and see him through, until he was restored to moral rectitude. I believe that Christ does this to the uttermost, for anyone who turns to Him in faith, pouring Himself out for us still in all the ways open to Infinite Love, until He brings us to God. The Cross to me is not a magical transaction in which He 'takes away sin and guilt'. The phrase has no meaning, for both remain to curse us. The Cross was the act of Christ by which He went to the uttermost, while still in the body, in poured-out love and service to man, as a token that in His risen life, through His Spirit, He will ever spend Himself for sinful men until Love has done all it can do and redeemed mankind.

It is not Christ's dying that saves us, but His love, the extent and 'uttermost' nature of which His Cross is the pledge.

That is a very inadequate word on a profound subject, but the exigencies of space and the scope of the essay demand brevity here.

We are still left with the problem of guilt. What happens to it? Is man left to bear it for ever? If he morally and spiritually progresses, will not the burden of it become intolerable, since more and more clearly he will see what a terrible thing in God's universe sin is, and by that fact will not his sense of guilt rather deepen than vanish?

Perhaps the simplest answer is a very personal one. Guilt remains, in the sense that nothing can so alter a past event so as to make me no longer blameworthy for the sin I committed. Yet, sin having been committed and guilt (= blameworthiness) having been inescapably fastened on me, if I, over a long period, commit myself to personal communion with and loyalty to the Saviour, the Saviour who went to the Cross and will never reject me if I seek His aid, then, though it is unthinkable that I should transfer my guilt to Him, He will and does transfer His grace to me, so that the evil feeling in guilt, its intolerable burden, its shame and remorse pass away and guiltiness becomes a qualification for service for Him, especially to those who are tempted where I fell. It gives me a new insight and sympathy for others. It saves me from that intolerable pride that went before my fall. There is nothing God cannot use for His purposes, if it is offered to Him, and included therein is guilt.

In this realm, psychology alone fails. Here, if anywhere, the Christian religion comes to the rescue. For myself, I welcome the immense help of psychotherapeutic treatment. But when, after perhaps a long analysis, trouble of mind or body is traced back to guilt, the psychologist can only say: 'Well that's that; you will get over it. Many people have done worse things than that.' It is just at that point that the patient feels an intolerable loneliness and is uncomfortable by the thought of those others who also have sinned. The minister should then be able to co-operate with the psychologist by bringing the good news of forgiveness, of a totally new beginning and, above all, of the Friend who steps in to meet man's need, to bear men's sins in the sense of identifying Himself with the sinner, to suffer for him just because He suffers with him, to commit Himself to the sinner until even the latter's guilt becomes an asset in the Divine economy, used in the service of the Redeemer of the World.

LESLIE D. WEATHERHEAD

A HIGHLAND HERESY-HUNT

ON 25th May 1831, an aged clergyman rose to his feet in the supreme ecclesiastical court of Scotland, the General Assembly of the Kirk, to say a last word on behalf of his son, who stood accused of a charge of the utmost gravity before that vast tribunal which was about to decide his fate. In the course of his speech someone shouted an objection that he was out of order; but he was allowed to continue, and at length ended with these words:

I bow to any decision to which you may think it right to come. Moderator, I am not afraid for my son; though his brethren cast him out the Master whom he serves will not forsake him; and while I live I will never be ashamed to be the father of so holy and blameless a son.

The Moderator, after the court's judgement had been given by an almost unanimous vote,¹ solemnly invited an old and trusted member to offer prayer. Then he said:

In the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, the sole King and Head of his Church, and by virtue of the power committed by him to it, I do now solemnly depose Mr. John M'Leod Campbell, minister of the parish of Row,² from the office of the holy ministry, prohibiting and discharging him from exercising the same, or any part thereof, in all time coming, under pain of the highest censure³ of the Church; and I do hereby declare the Church and Parish of Row vacant, from and after the day and date of this sentence.

John M'Leod Campbell was a clergyman of thirty, ordained but five years previously. That he was 'holy' was common knowledge, and I suppose that not one of his judges would have sought to deny it. His zeal and piety were widely recognized, and his own people in the lovely West Highland parish of Row had sent in a formal petition 'unto the Venerable the General Assembly', signed by ninety-five per cent of the inhabitants,⁴ attesting his diligence among them, expressing their gratitude for 'having so zealous and holy a man as their minister', and earnestly praying that he might not be taken away from them. The charge was a doctrinal one: against the accepted view of the Kirk, Campbell had preached that Christ died for all men, not only for the predestined and elect; yet he denied that this view, to which he held fast throughout

¹ The voting was: 119 for, 6 against. But a few who were present declined to vote, some did not answer their names when called, and it seems that of some 200 other members who had been present earlier in the Assembly, many had absented themselves with a view to avoiding the responsibility of voting one way or the other.

² In Dumbartonshire, Scotland. Pronounced *roo*, and now spelt *Rhu*, the original spelling. The case is commonly known as 'The Row Heresy'.

³ By this was meant excommunication. Traditionally, there are five judicial censures which the Kirk may administer to her clergy, admonition, rebuke, suspension, deposition, and excommunication. Though the last is of course the most drastic, deposition, which excludes the offender from participating in any of the spiritual privileges or material benefits of an office to which he has been appointed for life, is an extreme penalty which the rubrics direct should be 'resorted to only in very serious cases'.

⁴ Four hundred and twenty persons signed the petition, including one hundred and fifty 'heads of families'. In the remaining five per cent must be included the dissenting houses, and indifferent and incapacitated as well as disaffected parishioners.

the trial, was heretical, according to the Kirk's official standards. To understand the origin of the case of the 'Row Heresy' and appreciate its Christian significance, it is necessary to consider the spiritual condition of Scotland in the early part of the nineteenth century.

Even those who have seen the Kirk through rosy spectacles have found it hard to find anything good to say of this period of her history. Surely the atmosphere of the Kirk of that day has never been surpassed in Christendom for torpid bigotry, conservative tedium, and uninspiring gloom. From the end of the seventeenth century, when the Settlement had at last, after a long and exceedingly bitter struggle between the opposing forces of Episcopacy and Presbyterianism, established the latter throughout Scotland, the Kirk seemed to wield despotic power over a rough, hard people. The small native Episcopal Church was still oppressed and unpopular because of its old associations with the Jacobite cause, and the toleration extended by the State since 1712 to those of its clergy who were willing to swear allegiance to the House of Hanover had done nothing to mitigate the Kirk's hatred. The even more violently persecuted 'Papists' hardly counted at all; 'Popery' was but the stock bogey of every Scottish pulpit, and if in Defoe's England there were 'a hundred thousand stout country-fellows . . . ready to fight to the death against popery, without knowing whether popery was a man or a horse', these would have found counterparts in Scotland who were certain that he was anti-Christ. As for English Dissent, Scotland was almost wholly untouched by its influence. Even the Wesleys had made hardly any impression on her. It is true that the Kirk had lost some of her people through secessions from her own ranks; but such secessions had been political rather than religious, and by the beginning of the nineteenth century she had the appearance of being more firmly implanted in Scottish life than ever anything else had been. Her doctrine, polity, and structure seemed now to be immutable.

Those who knew her best, however, had many misgivings; nor without reason, for she was on the verge of the ten-year struggle leading to the most devastating schism in Scottish history, the Disruption of 1843. Shrewd observers saw how a cold and arid doctrinal rigour had been maintained side by side with an ever-increasing laxity in practice which neither Moderates nor Evangelicals could condone. In almost complete isolation from the rest of Christendom she had pursued her course with an eye on her chief object, the domination of Scottish life at all costs; but in fact Scotland had transformed the Kirk more than ever the Kirk had transformed Scotland. Contrary to popular belief, the Scots are not by nature an uncommonly religious people. From the Settlement to the Disruption they used the Kirk's Calvinism for their nationalistic and materialistic political aims without the Kirk producing anything that can be called theology except by a polite fiction. But by way of recompense to the Kirk, that same hard, northern people supported with perfervid loyalty the doctrinal peculiarities she had developed, such as the theory of the restricted Fatherhood of God. Whether by nature or misfortune the Scots had become a pathetically cynical race to whom David Hume, had he been widely understood among the masses, would have been more acceptable than any Christian theologian; but they had found a somewhat grotesque form of a rigid doctrinal system which they could and did use to their material advantage, and the

sense of uneasiness and insecurity felt by their leaders, though not at all urgent, was strong enough to make these foster a temper ferociously conservative in the worst sense. They had seen how much the Kirk had had to yield to the prejudices of a soured yet still somewhat wild people isolated from England and Europe. Worship had grown more and more slipshod, and Calvin's plan of strict ecclesiastical discipline had degenerated for the most part into the encouragement of publicly disgracing sexual offenders, often ignorant young girls, by arraigning them before the parish authorities in the most humiliating and unsavoury circumstances. Holy Communion, which Calvin had wanted to make the ordinary Sunday-morning service, had become instead an annual or half-yearly event, surrounded with elaborate prayer, fasting, and other arrangements extending over a week; these, however grave and impressive, made frequent celebration practically impossible. Instrumental music was rigorously forbidden, as also were hymns. Metrical psalms were sung dolefully and nasally by worshippers whose irreverence was so gross that they commonly entered the church with their hats on; they stood, or sat or sprawled on their stools, as they felt inclined, and would spit into the puddles on the earthen floor out of which sometimes protruded the very bones of their own dead. The dull pattern of the extremely long sermon had to be rigorously observed, for the slightest deviation was a very bad mark for the preacher. Christmas and Easter were abhorred and studiously unrecognized: the Kirk had regarded the restoration of the Christmas vacation in the law courts as the crowning insult of the Toleration Act of 1712.

The father of the 'Row heretic', Donald Campbell, was born in Skye in 1758; educated at Aberdeen, he married, in 1798, Mary, the youngest daughter of M'Leod of Raasay. After giving him three children, of whom John, born in 1800, was the eldest, she died in 1806. John spent his boyhood quietly at Kilninver, Argyllshire, where he had been born and where his father was minister. The latter must have been a somewhat unusual type of Scottish clergyman for those days: his son wrote of him afterwards that he preached in the tradition of Tillotson.⁶ In 1811 John went up to Glasgow University—such an early age was not uncommon then—and read there till he was about twenty, when he went to Edinburgh for a final winter's reading. In 1821 he was licensed to preach, but, being still very young, he was not ordained for some years. There is evidence that he had wanted to go to Oxford during these intervening years but was deterred out of loyalty to the Kirk. He had no objection, he wrote to his sister at the time, to that part of the Oxford oath which bound him to the admission that the Book of Common Prayer was agreeable to the Word of God; but the promise to use it 'and none other' was plainly incompatible with a prospective ministry in the Established Church of Scotland.

Determined to keep out of the Kirk's party factions, he went to Row in 1825 with all the earnest zeal one could wish for in a young clergyman. On the first day of his parish-visiting at Row, his last call was on an old couple in a cottage

⁶ Letter to his eldest son, 8th March 1870. *Memorials* (2 vols., Macmillan 1877), edited by his son Donald Campbell; Vol. I, p. 72. Even as late as the 1860's, says Lord Sands (*The Order and Conduct of Divine Service in the Church of Scotland*, p. 43), there was still a strong prejudice in many districts against what were called 'practical' sermons, that is, sermons which touched on specific moral questions such as stealing or lying.

near Garelochhead. They walked with him to the brow of the hill overlooking the beautiful lochside, and the old man pleaded, as he shook hands warmly with the new incumbent, 'Give us plain doctrine, Mr. Campbell, for we are a sleeping people'; to which his wife gravely added an apocalyptic quotation: 'Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee a crown of life.'

But by about the end of 1827, Campbell's preaching was being discussed with grave disapproval at gatherings of clergy in Glasgow and even Edinburgh. Some of the clergy had been at first attracted to that part of his doctrine which declared the first step in religion to be assurance of God's love to his children, and of their 'individually having eternal life given them in Christ'. But when they heard Campbell go so far as to speak of Christ having died for all men it was too much for even the most broad-minded among them to swallow. Some objected that, were this the extent of the Atonement, then the assurance of which he spoke could have little value. When Campbell met his detractors to explain his doctrine more fully, he found them so ill disposed to listen that when they saw that they could not get him to accept their extreme Calvinism they left him, sworn enemies of his 'novel' doctrine. It is from that time that the gradually increasing weight of persecution against him may be traced, though it was about three years before it took shape in a formal prosecution in Dumbarton Presbytery.⁶ Meantime pamphlets had been written against him and many pulpits had resounded with denunciations of his doctrinal 'innovations', while he seems to have borne all with a remarkable patience, as if he fully expected opposition, even indeed as though he prognosticated his own ultimate doom in the General Assembly. He did nothing rash, said nothing specially provocative, except that he continued the quiet exposition in his pulpit and occasionally elsewhere of the simple message that Christ died for all men. Such was his spiritual serenity that while the charges were being made against him in Presbytery he found time, though his careful answers ran into one hundred and eighty-one pages, to write to his father, saying, in the most calm, matter-of-fact way that the case had already been 'substantially decided' against him—that is, he expected deposition—and signing himself as 'abiding in the peace of God and the secret of the Lord's presence at Dumbarton at the Presbytery bar'.⁷

It had been Campbell's contention throughout the proceedings in all the courts of the Kirk that what he taught was not inconsistent with the Westminster Confession, the Kirk's equivalent of the Thirty-nine Articles. The Confession was drawn up, he maintained, under the authority of a Commission which recognized the English Articles as the basis of the Westminster Assembly's deliberations. Had the Westminster divines set forth a doctrine of limited Atonement they would have been acting against the commission given to them; but they did not. Moreover, Campbell noted, all the great Christian statements of doctrine recognize a universal Atonement except the Westminster Confession which, however, though it does not affirm it, does not deny it; it

⁶ Presbytery is the court of ordinary jurisdiction over the clergy, exercising functions comparable to those of the bishop in episcopal systems; Synod is a court of appeal consisting of several presbyteries; Assembly, the final court of appeal, has supreme jurisdiction over all the Kirk's affairs.

⁷ Many years later Principal Shairp confessed to having shared with Norman Macleod, another Scottish divine, the strange feeling that when one talked alone with Campbell there was 'a Third Being' present (*Memorials*, Vol. II, p. 345).

does not 'set forth any lie'. It ought, no doubt, to have stated the truth explicitly, having regard to the testimony of Scripture, the Fathers, and the early Creeds; yet the Kirk had indeed fallen away from her own standards as well as those of all Christendom, developing an error peculiar to herself and without Scriptural or other authority. All this was, I think, a fairly tenable interpretation of the facts, open to doubt though some of it may be.

The Assembly sat throughout the whole night till six o'clock the following morning. The prosecution's speeches were dreadfully long, even for those days, and heavily laden with Calvinistic technicalities.⁸ Old family friends trounced Campbell for perverting the Kirk's doctrine with his dangerous opinions.⁹ Yet in recalling the scene more than thirty years afterwards, that which pained him more than anything else¹⁰ was that he had heard one of his judges ('a D.D.', he observes with sorrow) say: 'He cannot preach this and be a minister of the Church of Scotland. Let him go to England and preach it, and we may bid him God speed.' That anyone should conceive of the doctrine that Christ died for all men being true south of the border and false north of it still horrified Campbell even at an age by which he must have had ample opportunity for seeing embryo-forms of pragmatism pass themselves off for religion. But he points out quite simply that the question should have been: 'What is the truth of God here?'

One of the first tasks the unfrocked clergyman set himself was to return to Row to arrange some matters connected with the Poor Fund of the parish. Then on a warm Sunday evening in July he preached to a vast congregation in the open-air. Many who could not join the crowd listened from windows to a sermon which had no bitterness but only the familiar message of God's love to all mankind. Then, having bidden farewell to the parish he loved, he spent some weeks preaching on hillsides and elsewhere in various parts of the West Highlands. Wherever he went he found many who deplored the condition of the Kirk which had cast out of her ministry a man of such spiritual integrity and zeal. Many of those Bible-reading peasants must have been puzzled to know how Campbell's teaching that the Fatherhood of God was universal could be contrary to Scripture, as the General Assembly said it was. Interest in Campbell's message grew, and friends and supporters built him a little independent chapel in Blackfriars Street, Glasgow, in which he ministered till his health broke down and he had to give up regular preaching. It was typical of him that when he left this chapel he advised the people who had loyally supported him there to return to the fold of the Kirk which had cast him out.

During the years that followed he travelled, studied, and talked with many divines who were eager to discuss theology with him; these included men as widely different in outlook as Charles Kingsley, F. D. Maurice, and the future

⁸ The *Report* runs into 200 closely printed pages. It was published by Lusk, Greenock, in 1831: *A Full Report of the Proceedings in the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, in the case of the Rev. John M'Leod Campbell, late Minister of Row*. The proceedings in the inferior courts, no less tedious, have also been published.

⁹ On the other hand, Robert Story, Minister of the neighbouring parish of Romeath, vigorously opposed the prosecution throughout the debate. His successor's son, Charles Warr, Dean of the Thistle and of the Chapel Royal in Scotland, preached at Row at the centenary in 1926 of Campbell's induction there.

¹⁰ Letter to D. J. Vaughan, 13th November 1862 (*Memorials*, Vol. II, p. 35).

Cardinal Manning. In 1854 he wrote *The Nature of the Atonement*,¹¹ which shows considerable insight into the philosophical aspect of the problem that had agitated Campbell's mind at a less mature stage in his thought. It was followed by *Christ the Bread of Life* and other works, and by the time that Campbell had reached his sixties he had the joy of seeing even the theological halls of Scotland teach candidates for the Kirk's ministry much of the doctrine that had cost him deposition in his youth. Led by John Caird in 1868, the University of Glasgow, as a token of amendment for the Kirk's sin of 1831, bestowed its D.D., *honoris causa*, on the 'Row heretic'. His friends rightly interpreted this conferment as one of extraordinary import. During his ministry at Row, one of them had said sadly, 'They won't make a D.D. of Campbell'; but now the recognition came to him as a deposed clergyman.¹² In 1871, the year before his death, distinguished representatives of all the principal denominations in Scotland besides the Kirk paid formal tribute to the deepening of religious thought and life in Scotland which Campbell had effected without ever forgetting the 'meekness and gentleness of Christ'. This pure-hearted man, seeing in that manifestation only the triumph of truth over error, was especially delighted by it.

Biblical criticism was by this time beginning to rouse interest and, of course, fierce controversy. Typical of Campbell's reaction to such questions (his love for the Bible he knew was always mingled with his passionate zeal for theological truth) is the advice he gave to his eldest son the year before the latter was ordained deacon in the Church of England: he recommended him to let such criticism stimulate his mind without too lightly carrying off his heart. Recalling how he had loved the beauty of the Cambridge Backs,¹³ he added:

I am glad that my John sees them as I saw them. . . . But I go back to other elements at Cambridge . . . with most interest to *our* receiving the bread and wine *together* at St. Mary's.¹⁴

Then a few hours after the ordination:¹⁵

I read the Ordination Service to your mother after breakfast to help her realization of it. . . . I seem to myself to be in these days realizing what it is to enter on the ministry more than I did even when receiving ordination myself. . . . I do not forget that there is an important addition to 'take heed unto thyself', in the words 'and to thy doctrine';¹⁶ but I am persuaded if all that is implied in taking due heed unto oneself were more realized, the addition would be seen to be less in proportion than it usually seems.

Perhaps Campbell never showed more clearly than in this word of paternal counsel his faith in the intimate connexion between moral and other human values and the Christian truth revealed by God. This conviction had been at the root of his protest in 1831 against the Kirk which had falsely tried to sever the bond between the two.

On Monday 19th February 1872 Campbell wrote to his son Donald referring

¹¹ This is said to have been used within Campbell's lifetime as the textbook of most of the Scottish theological professors: C. L. Warr, *Alfred Warr of Rosneath* (Gardner, Paisley 1917), p. 69.

¹² *Memorials*, Vol. II, p. 208.

¹³ Letter, 21st May 1865; *ibid.*, p. 91.

¹⁴ Campbell's italics.

¹⁵ Letter, 11th June 1865; *ibid.*

¹⁶ 1 Timothy 4¹⁶.

to 'a good sermon by Robert yesterday from the words: "I thank thee that thou hast hid those things from the wise and prudent, and revealed them unto babes."' That afternoon he visited an old friend who was dying and prayed with her. On the way back with his wife he stopped in the garden to help to plant some roses. On Wednesday he took ill, and during the rest of the week he kept repeating to himself passages from devotional works. Early on Tuesday morning he died at Achnashie ('the field of peace'), in the house which one of his friends had bought for him at Rosneath looking across the Gareloch to the scene of his brief ministry, the lovely parish in which he had laboured till his deposition at the age of thirty and which he had never ceased to love with all the courageous tenderness of his heart. He was buried in the Rosneath churchyard, near the dust of St. Modan, where also lies his son, Sir James Campbell, K.C.I.E.; and above the grave a tablet on the wall of the old ruined church records how his grandson Kenneth laid down his life in 1915 near the shattered towers of Ypres.

In a charming essay on the country parson of Caroline England, Mr. A. L. Rowse reflects on George Herbert's 'love of music . . . of flowers and birds and church bells, of the old country customs and the country people'. It was such things that delighted the gentle heart of Campbell, and indeed his temperament had many affinities with that of the saintly Rector of Bemerton, for he, too, knew how to combine a tender unworldliness, human sympathy, and common sense, with a quietly rigorous fidelity to duty and God. But it was not given to him for long to enjoy without disturbance the inner peace of his soul. The Kirk still thought very much in terms of the *jogges*,¹⁷ and she treated him neither more nor less unimaginatively than her practice at that time would have led one to expect. For Campbell the road to Achnashie entailed a very bitter journey; yet few can have more confidently taken to their comfort the words of the Gospel: 'Blessed are ye, when men shall revile you, and persecute you, and shall say all manner of evil against you falsely, for my sake. Rejoice, and be exceeding glad: for great is your reward in heaven: for so persecuted they the prophets which were before you.'

GEDDES MACGREGOR

¹⁷ These were iron rings for the neck, used in public punishment ordered by the courts of the Kirk. Specimens are still to be found hanging outside the doors of some churches in Scotland, for instance at Duddingston, Edinburgh. Though they had fallen into general disuse by Campbell's time, Dr. George Sprott, a careful historian, writes as late as 1868 of how 'till within a few years a common threat to children was: "The Minister will put you in the jogges".'

D. H. LAWRENCE AND THE REVOLT AGAINST REASON

THE EARLIEST verdict on D. H. Lawrence as a novelist was pronounced by Ford Madox Hueffer. Lawrence himself reports it in a fragment of autobiography written about seventeen years later. Hueffer had become the editor of the *English Review* and was putting new life into it. He had already printed some of Lawrence's poems, sent to him not by Lawrence himself, but by the girl who was the chief friend of his youth—the 'Miriam' of *Sons and Lovers*. Hueffer not only printed the poems but asked his new contributor to come and see him, and it seems that he took a warm interest in him from their first acquaintance—as, apparently, people who met him nearly always did. Lawrence was then twenty-three and a teacher in an elementary school at Croydon. For four years he had been working in his spare time at his first novel, *The White Peacock*, getting it, he says—and the phrase, as we shall see later, is significant—'in inchoate bits, from the underground of my consciousness.' He spoke of it to Hueffer who asked at once to see the manuscript. 'He read it', says Lawrence, 'immediately, with the greatest cheery sort of kindness and bluff. And in his queer voice, when we were in an omnibus in London, he shouted in my ear: "It's got every fault that the English novel can have. . . . But", shouted Hueffer in the bus, "you've got GENIUS."'

That was a judgement which is likely to stand. What Hueffer was thinking of particularly, Lawrence implies, was the formlessness of the English novel as compared with French models, for at that time 'the English novel was supposed to have so many faults, in comparison with the French, that it was hardly allowed to exist at all'. That of course was a rather ridiculous generalization; as though Victor Hugo was a neater craftsman than Arnold Bennett, or Proust more laconic than W. S. Maugham. It is true however that all Lawrence's long stories are about as shapeless as anything with claims to be a work of art could be. It is quite certain that he never plotted them beforehand or had much idea when he began to write how they were going to turn out; and it may be doubted whether any reader, when he has finished one of his books, has more than a vague notion of what it is all 'about'. Moreover he had no style; he was much too impetuous a writer to acquire one. He would not wait to get his ideas clearly in mind before putting them into words, but drove at them in the hope that they would come out somehow if he only beat the bush long enough. As Herbert Read says, 'a button-holing, nagging prolixity of style' is one of his most serious faults. But worst of all—and this at least is not a common fault of the English novelists—he was never on good terms with his own characters for very long; they got on his nerves. The truth is that he couldn't stand people. He had little charity and hardly any humour, and his attitude to his characters is that of an irritable and over-conscious man forced to live in intolerable intimacy with people who impinge too sharply on his sensibilities. This excessive, almost morbid, awareness was indeed his principal stock-in-trade, and he had very little else. But it makes him an extremely uncomfortable writer, for if the people he wrote about got on his nerves they are bound to get on ours.

It might have been expected that such faults as these would have proved a serious hindrance, especially at the outset of his career as a writer, but it was not so. From the first he met with unusual encouragement. As we have seen, he did not even have to exert himself to get a start; he himself says that the girl who sent his poems to the *English Review* launched him on his literary career 'like a princess cutting a cord, launching a ship'. Hueffer took the manuscript of *The White Peacock* off his hands and sent it to William Heinemann, who accepted it at once and paid him £50 down on publication; and even after the suppression of *The Rainbow* by the Bow Street magistrate had brought him a notoriety which might have frightened off respectable publishers, he had surprisingly little difficulty in placing his work. There was something about him that attracted people and made them eager to serve him. Hugh Kingsmill puts it down to the fact that he had been a much-mothered child; 'it is natural to provide a leaning wall with a prop.' There is something in this, but it takes more than an appealing manner to melt the hearts of editors and publishers, and many of the people who were drawn to Lawrence were men and women of first-rate ability who would certainly have seen through him if there had been nothing more in him than a pleasing pathos. They cannot have been blind to the serious faults of his work, but they were all of the same mind as Hueffer; in spite of everything, they saw that he had GENIUS.

This is not to say that he was a popular writer—that he never became; at best it was a *succès d'estime*. His reputation grew steadily, but it was a limited one and somewhat in the nature of a cult; to the general public he was known vaguely as a purveyor of salacious stuff who had got into trouble once with the authorities and probably had very good reasons for keeping out of the country. But this did not help his sales, as it did in the case of Aldous Huxley, who with a rather similar reputation enjoyed considerable success. Lawrence's turgid style and dim tormented burrowings into the mental underworld were more than the public could stomach. To the last he was probably regarded by most people as being, in his own phrase, 'a queer fish who could write a bit'.

It was not until Middleton Murry brought out *Son of Woman* after Lawrence's death that the fog began to lift and the reading public got the clue which put them in the way of understanding him. This extraordinary book put forward an interpretation which at once found acceptance. There were several reasons for this. For one thing Murry was able to speak with first-hand knowledge. He had been among the first to recognize Lawrence's remarkable powers. As the editor of a literary review he had published some of his earliest work, and when he made Lawrence's acquaintance, as he did without delay, he fell at once, like so many others, under his personal spell. He had lived and worked with him for several years on terms of the closest intimacy, and was as fully acquainted as any man with his early history; and though at a later period they had become estranged they did not entirely lose touch with one another right up to the time of Lawrence's death. The inner story of their relations was exposed by Murry in a subsequent book, *Reminiscences of D. H. Lawrence*, which was a reply to an attack on *Son of Woman* by Mrs. Catherine Carswell, another of Lawrence's friends. (Sooner or later Lawrence quarrelled with all his friends, and what is more they all seem to have quarrelled with one another.) This second book is written with a candour which makes rather painful reading,

though Murry protests that it was forced upon him, as the truth could not be told in any other way. It is the revelation of an emotional intimacy which became unbearable, for they were both over-conscious men, and their understanding of one another was too complete to be endured.

But what excited immediate interest was the fact that Murry was able to show in these two books that the novels can only be understood if it is recognized that they are, as it were, instalments of a spiritual autobiography, a sustained report, written at white heat by a man who was a born confessor, of an inner life of conflicts and passions so intense that they tore his soul to pieces. The true nature of the conflict was not fully understood by Lawrence himself, not because he was incapable of understanding it, but because he dared not face it. It is projected in the novels, but they must be read as a psychological fantasy in which he is seeking to deceive and justify himself. That he was not entirely unconscious of this purpose—and it is a trick which we all play upon ourselves—seems evident from some words of his own: 'The curious thing about art-speech is that it prevaricates so terribly, I mean it tells such lies. I suppose because we always, all the time, tell ourselves lies. . . . Truly art is a sort of subterfuge. But thank God for it, we can see through the subterfuge if we choose. . . . The proper function of the critic is to save the tale from the artist who created it.'¹ This is what Murry undertook to do in *Son of Woman*. It was a psycho-analytic approach to a literary problem, and naturally it aroused great interest at a time when everybody was thinking in Freudian terms.

Son of Woman was first published in 1931. At that date it was not possible to see one thing which has since become only too clear—that Lawrence, in depicting the history of his own soul, was unconsciously doing something much more significant; he was evoking and bringing into the open the dark forces which, working in the underworld of the contemporary mind, were weakening its hold on sanity and preparing it for the plunge into anarchy which the world was about to take. This is the real significance of Lawrence. Whether he knew it or not, he was speaking out of the cloud of madness that was gathering, not in his own soul only but in the soul of mankind, and the genius that men recognized in him was a spirit of prophecy. 'We are flowers of dissolution—*fleurs du mal*', he makes one of his characters say, passing verdict on the culture of a decaying civilization; it is equally a verdict on his own work. 'Nothing', says Herbert Read, 'is more startling than the dead accuracy of Lawrence's awareness of what was going to happen in Germany, in Europe, years after his death.' Not that Lawrence meddled much with politics; it was on a deeper level that he made his communion with the spirit of the age. He had dedicated himself to destruction, and by virtue of that choice he became one of the prophetic voices that warned the world, if it had but understood, of the doom it was bringing on itself.

That it *was* a choice, or rather a yielding, is unhappily true—the novels themselves are evidence enough of that; it was, in Mr. Murry's words, 'a thirst for destruction, a nostalgia for chaos'. He turned away from the mental and moral sanities that make life wholesome and willed himself into the blind life of instinct and unreason. He cultivated mindlessness and made a religion of sexuality—going back, as he was for ever saying, to the phallic source; he took

¹ Quoted by Middleton Murry from the preface to *Studies in Classical American Literature*.

refuge from thought in the sub-human awareness of the 'solar plexus'—whatever he meant by that—and the 'blood'. And in all this he was anticipating the anarchism which before long would intoxicate the German soul, talking the language of Rosenberg and Ludendorff, yielding to the power-madness that already possessed Hitler and was driving him on to destroy the world. For Lawrence too, in his own way, was the victim of a neurotic craving for power. His friends must be willing to be his disciples; they must enter into a blood-bond of entire devotion, and if they refused he would have none of them. This seems to be the meaning of that rather horrible episode in the *Café Royal* of which Mrs. Carswell and Mr. Murry have given contradictory accounts. Lawrence had formed the plan of creating the nucleus of a new society in New Mexico, with himself as a sort of Messiah; and Murry had promised to go with him, but afterwards drew back. At a farewell dinner at the *Café Royal*, Murry, who admits that he may have been a little drunk, kissed him, 'for the first and last time in my life', and said, according to his own account: 'I love you, Lorenzo, but I won't promise not to betray you.' If there is any doubt about how this was understood at the time, it is surely settled by the words of Lawrence himself in a letter written to Murry afterwards: 'Don't let us have any more of this Jesus-Judas business; it's obscene.'

What is the personal story that lies behind this 'savage pilgrimage', as Mrs. Carswell calls it—this rejection by a modern man of reason and the civilized consciousness? That is the question which Middleton Murry's book undertakes to answer. It is I believe only a partial answer, but true enough as far as it goes. Like most psychological dramas it went back to his earliest years; the injury to his spirit was done by the person he loved best, loved so completely that afterwards he was never able rightly to love another. And all his life he was struggling to break the bondage of that love. That, in epitome, is Lawrence's story.

At the home in the colliery town of Eastwood, in Nottinghamshire, where he was born, the two ways of life between which, eventually, he was to make his choice, were forced inescapably on him in his most impressionable years, for they were incarnated in the two persons who, to a child, must always matter most; his mother, and his father. He was the fourth child of John Arthur Lawrence, a miner who from the age of seven had worked at Brinsley Colliery, and of his wife Lydia. From his father he inherited the sensuous nature which, on the physical side, conditioned him as a poet, but the father's virility and masculine coarseness, which might have served as a necessary ballast to his high-strung sensibility, did not come down to him. He was a delicate child with a weak chest; a potential consumptive. Like other men of genius whose virility was below the normal—Nietzsche and Baudelaire are the best-known examples—he made a psychological over-compensation by indulging in dreams of brute masterfulness and uninhibited masculinity. In the novels the sex-relation is constantly represented as a struggle for domination which can end in nothing less than the annihilation of the woman by the man or the man by the woman. It was a struggle of this sort which was the actual tragedy of his early home, and the woman was the victor. But while on the conscious level Lawrence was passionately on the side of his mother, his deep instinctive sympathies were with his father; and in the end it was the father's way that he went.

Mrs. Lawrence was a notable example of the fact that men of genius usually have remarkable mothers. The father was a primitive type, clever with his hands but quite unintellectual, affectionate and good-natured in a happy-go-lucky fashion, irresponsible, a friendly animal. With a wife of his own sort he might have been happy enough, but he was married to a woman who was in every way his superior and quickly came to despise him, and she made it the fixed object of her life to rescue her children from his influence. This she could only do by destroying him. The hostility of his family drove him more and more out of the house to console himself with his workmates in the public-house, and often he came home the worse for drink. The mother countered this by bringing up her children to be fierce teetotallers.

In every way she was his opposite. Her daughter Ada has given the following description of her:

She was small and slight in figure, her brown hair, sprinkled with grey, brushed straight back from a broad brow; clear blue eyes that always looked fearless and unflinching, and a delicately shaped nose; . . . tiny hands and feet, and a sure carriage. Some people were ill-natured enough to say that she 'put it on' when she spoke, for her English was good and her accent so different from that of the folk round about.

Try as she might, she could never speak the local dialect, and we children were always careful about it when we were with her, even though we let fling among our friends. She loved to read, and every week piles of books were fetched from the local library to be enjoyed when we were in bed. The minister liked to visit her, and they discussed religion and philosophy, for she was an excellent talker, and had a dry, whimsical, fascinating sense of humour.

At heart she was deeply religious and a stickler for truth, having great contempt for anything petty, vain, or frivolous.^a

Religion and education, the chapel and the school—these were the means by which, she was determined, her children should raise themselves. Every Sunday they were sent to morning and evening service at the Congregational Chapel to which she belonged, and to Sunday school in the afternoon; and Lawrence kept up the habit of attendance, though with less strictness, until he left Eastwood for Croydon at the age of twenty-three. In an essay entitled *Hymns in a Man's Life* he acknowledges his debt to this training. Though he claims that he had 'got over' Christian dogma by the time he was sixteen, there remained with him for ever the wonder and the sense of mystery born of worship, the awareness of the unseen, the knowledge of the Bible, and, not the least of the benefits of his training, the Puritan independence and fighting-spirit. 'Here', he says, 'is the clue to the ordinary Englishman—in the Nonconformist hymns.'

In later life, when he had veered round to a fierce anti-Puritanism, he still declared, 'I am a passionately religious man'; and in everything he wrote it is plain beyond dispute that his was the religious type of consciousness, that all his apprehensions were of the religious sort. But with him, as with Blake and, let it be said, with St. Paul, the religious sense led to a rejection of the moral training which he had received. For the cultivation of 'virtue', the worried

^a *Early Life of D. H. Lawrence.*

concern to do always what is 'right', gives rise to a kind of moral neurosis which either leaves a man in the grip of a sense of sin or, what is very much worse, leads to a negative moralism which prides itself only on abstention from a limited range of acts that are held to be 'wrong'. But Lawrence knew by a true instinct that this is not religion; religion is release; it is the baptism of power; it is the gift of the Holy Ghost. The moral pedantries of the Puritan, like those of the Pharisee, are not religion; they are the negation of religion. The truth is that, whether he knew it or not, the mind of Lawrence had been brought up against the decisive Pauline *crux* of faith and works. To what extent the evangelical preaching to which he must have listened in the Congregational Chapel at Eastwood had made him aware of this issue it is not possible to say, but it is almost bound to emerge in one form or another in the consciousness of a man with religious intuitions who has undergone the Puritan discipline. What 'the law' was to St. Paul, scruples of conscience are to the Puritan. 'I hope you will never become scrupulous', said the wise Baron Von Hügel to his niece. 'It is a bad thing all round, a morbid conscientiousness and brooding.' Certainly it could never satisfy a man like Lawrence. His rejection of Puritanism was the protest of a 'passionately religious' nature against the intolerable burden of moral obligation which it lays upon the conscience. From that burden he must be delivered; he must by some means obtain release into a state of consciousness which was beyond good and evil. This, of course, is Nietzsche's phrase, but it is possible to believe that it is one which St. Paul would not have rejected, though he would certainly not have understood it in the same sense. It may perhaps be said that for the Puritan seeking a way of salvation the choice lies between Paul and Nietzsche; either you are caught up into the life of God, where morality is transcended and works are superseded by grace (the Pauline way)—or you seek to return to the pre-moral innocence of the instinctive pagan mind (which was the way of Nietzsche); and it was that solution to which Lawrence turned. With him it was not release from a lower morality into a higher one, a turning-away from 'works' to 'grace'—it was a plunge into a-morality. Release was to come by casting off restraint. He went back to the orgasm of the phallic cult. The repressions of Puritanism were overcome by reverting to the instinctive life; he broke his bondage to the mother he loved by passionately going over to the side of the father she had taught him to despise.

But in the very vehemence of his preaching it is possible to detect a secret doubt, a haunting, persistent, ineluctable misgiving; he protests too much. He is trying to convince himself, writing at the top of his voice in an endeavour to shout down a bad conscience. For he had sinned, and with his training, and being the man he was, he could not sin with impunity.

The story is well known, though it is commonly alluded to with reserve; that I suppose is inevitable while two of the persons principally concerned are still living. Among those who had given him help and encouragement in his youth was Professor Ernest Weekley, who was then on the staff of Nottingham University. He had coached Lawrence in French when he was attending the University, and some years later Lawrence called on him to discuss the chance of a lectureship in a German university for which he thought of applying; it was during this visit that he met Mrs. Weekley. She was the daughter of a

German baron and sister of the air ace who in the first world-war commanded the 'Richthofen Circus' in which Goering was trained. At the time of this first meeting, in the spring of 1912, she was in her early thirties, some years older than Lawrence, and the mother of three children. She is described as physically impressive, 'of ample Teutonic build, with greenish eyes radiating will'. Within a month she and Lawrence left England together for Germany; and eventually, after her husband had divorced her, they were married.

Mr. Murry makes little of this, but I cannot but believe that it is an essential clue to this tragically self-divided man. His rage against civilization was born of the necessity he felt to justify himself; in order to make himself feel that he was right he indicted all the traditions in which modern man has trusted. He is the Hitler of the intellect, the man who must be right though all the world is declared to be wrong; it is Lawrence *contra mundum*. And he is driven to revolt not only against morals but against the mind. We must turn away from thought, he declares, for to think is always to falsify. When we begin to reason we become entangled in words, in verbal logic, and invariably that leads our minds astray. For we are never able to *say* what we mean, and if we persist in trying to do so we shall no longer *know* what we mean. He wanted to abolish education altogether, for education is the enemy of wisdom; it robs us of the certitude of direct intuition and replaces it by nothing better than second-hand knowledge. We must follow the perceptions of the blood, the instincts, the passions—the dark oracles of the unconscious; they alone are sure of themselves and go straight to the mark. Like Rousseau, whom in so many ways he resembled, he wanted to restore an Eden of primitive simplicity. His mother was the angel with the flaming sword who had driven him out and forced him to dwell among the *bourgeoisie*, but he belonged to the common people and he would get back to them in spite of her. And so he went on his 'savage pilgrimage' to find a refuge from thought among the peasants of Southern Europe, the settlers of Australia, the mindless Indians of Mexico.

Once again, we are reminded of the modern reversion to barbarism; the German doctrine of 'blood and soil', the return to the worship of ancestral gods. The importance of Lawrence is that he so faithfully represents this regression of the spirit of man; for it is not only a German movement, it is the first tremblings of what may yet become the landslide of Christian civilization. I do not know to what extent the current interest in psychoanalysis is to be taken as another symptom of this relapse, but I suspect that for many people it is the substitute-religion that is creeping in to fill the vacuum left by unbelief. It seems to me that we are much too conscious of the Unconscious, and the fascination that it exercises over the modern mind is a perilous thing. The rationalism of the nineteenth century has given birth to a strange monster—an implicit belief in the sub-mental, the cult of irrationality; and of that superstition D. H. Lawrence was the prophet.

W. S. HANDLEY JONES

EDUCATION: POSITIVE OR NEGATIVE

THE PURPOSE of education is to develop the critical spirit, to teach a boy to detect false argument, to recognize rubbish, to train him not to be "taken in" by fallacies and superstition.' Sentences such as this have been very common amongst educational writings during the present century, and the aim unlike many others so frequently propounded, has often been achieved in secondary grammar schools. It is an aim which must certainly have a place today in all secondary schools—especially perhaps in the modern secondary school. Surely a great end of life is to find truth, and in order to do this a beginning can be made by detecting falsehood.

But on closer examination we may well find that it is no great end in itself: it is rather a means, a clearing of the ground for some greater purpose. It has been the kind of half-way house, worth great effort to achieve, involving a climb extremely congenial to present-century ideas; but the second half of the climb has seldom been defined, and its more austere paths have remained shrouded in clouds. In fact many people are beginning to find that this useful but second-rate ideal has now become a hindrance to creative work and constructive thought. The slightly educated man can clear his house of devils, but swept and garnished it merely awaits unpleasant new tenants.

It is interesting to trace the development of this critical spirit. One of its earlier manifestations was in the religious world at the end of the last century, when the growth of scientific ideas and the theories of evolution swept the more intelligent sections of the country. It was all too frequently that the smattering of science known in secondary schools gave its owners a greater certainty in doubt than they had ever had in faith. A little dubious science and a dash of the even less understood higher criticism made belief in miracles impossible and disposed of much other quaint belief. Scripture teaching continued, but often it was patronizingly done, and boys assumed that like their teachers they would outgrow its necessity before long.

Science was the hope of the future. With the new education, the new science, the new progress, humanism would be triumphant in the new century. Prosperity like happiness was just ahead, and many would have believed in Mr. Belloc's lines:

*When science has discovered something more,
We shall be happier than we were before.*

Religious instruction became a lesson in criticism during which the pupil was trained to 'see through' outmoded stories and beliefs.

The same process was happening in social affairs, where the older class-order of society was being overturned. The world of the squire, the parson, of servants touching caps to superiors, was ruthlessly satirized. It was in politics rather than in church that the famous verse was so often heard:

*The rich man in his castle,
The poor man at the gate,
He made them high or lowly
And ordered their estate.*

The new education made it easy for us to 'see through' all such ideas. A little later the critical biographies and more satirical histories began to appear. The great men so revered in the past were only human. We 'saw through' the greatness of the past as we read the brightness of Mr. Lytton Strachey or listened to the brilliance of Mr. Shaw.

*The rich man in his motor,
The poor man on his bike,
God did not make them different;
He made them just alike.*

So the older Whig history passed, and except for those who escaped by romanticizing the middle ages, we learned the impossibility of being impartial in history. It was propaganda which the bright student could 'see through'. 'History', said Mr. Ford, 'is bunk.'

In politics we had the reaction from the imperial ideas of Victorian England. 'The white man's burden' was a phrase at which to sneer; all the empire came by fraud and oppression; it was kept only to exploit the poor natives. It was in the satire of politics far more than the music-hall that the classic lines of Jingoism were heard:

*We don't want to fight you,
But by Jingo if we do . . .*

The parody version originally sung with equal gusto was not quoted:

*I don't want to fight;
I'll be slaughtered if I do;
I'd let the Russians have Constantinople.*

In literature the Victorian values were questioned. There was the normal reaction against the world of one's father—and the Victorian literary world was one of 'high seriousness', of prophets, and earnestness. These tended to sound ridiculous in the new age, and we heard much of 'stuffy' Victorian attitudes and judgements. Then into the secondary school came the study of 'Eng. Lit.', and the need of potted opinions for examinations. There was little time for wide readings of authors because second-hand judgements of authors must be memorized. Short histories of English literature had large sales, and all good pupils memorized in a very few sentences the failings of the poets and novelists of the past. If only the writers of the past could have had our advice, how different they might have been! Shakespeare could have found new plots and have rewritten his dull patches; Chaucer's crudities could have been smoothed out: Pope taught to be romantic; and the Romantics have been given classical grace. Any intelligent schoolboy of sixteen could pronounce judgement.

Into an educational world seething with such ideas came the two wars, leaving their aftermath of doubt and disillusion. The bright world of humanism disappeared; man was apparently as capable of the concentration camp as the garden city; science produced not only labour-saving devices but atom bombs. We become critical even of critics, disillusioned even with our own political

parties and sure only of human dishonesty and second-rate motives. Only the uneducated could be enthusiastic.

So most writers on education today see plenty of superficial instruction but little purpose, excellent visual aids and no vision, minute and careful analysis and no synthesis, means and no ends.

I believe that this process has been good for English education and that our questioning has served a useful purpose; but the time has come to stress construction, creation, synthesis. We must cease only to 'see through' things, and learn to discover reality on the other side of the glass we have seen through darkly. Let us glance again at our previous examples.

It is most important that in religious education the findings of scholarship and archaeology should be accepted and explained, and it is only sensible that before boys and girls leave school they should begin to understand the philosophic problems of religious belief. It is ridiculous that these should burst upon adolescents after they have left school where they might be given help. But it is even more important that they should be introduced to the positive side of religion, that they should know something of the thrill of achievement of the great Christian saints, adventurers, and philanthropists. It is perhaps of little importance if they are hazy about the chronology of Jewish history or the geography of St. Paul's journeys, but certainly they should in adolescence have spent time in examining the revolutionary ideas of Christ, and have some understanding of Christian teaching on man, society, and God.

Time, too, must be spent in the company of a few of the great Christian philosophers, thinkers, and saints: Paul, Augustine, Thomas Aquinas, Luther, Wesley. It is better to know one in some detail than to have a vague knowledge of many. Is it possible to give our pupils a taste of the joy and rapture to be found in the best religious literature—the ecstatic joy in the world of Traherne, for example? Can we begin to show them the religious experience to be found in the beauty of great cathedrals and churches; in the perfection of music, poetry, and the great hymns; in the self-sacrifice and adventure of Christian workers today? Some even argue that religion in schools has been far too concerned with the past, but if we do not grant this, we should see that our pupils have a taste of its present joys. Religion must be something of present positive value, and its taste can be acquired in youth.

The same positive approach could be applied to many other subjects, especially perhaps to literature and history. We must get back to the texts, to the plays, novels, poems, and essays, and having read them learn to enjoy them. It will probably not matter very much if our little text-books of criticism and literary history are lost in the process, and if we forget to notice the usual criticisms of the usual writers. There will be value in quantity; there may also be value in detailed study of a particular work or writer. It is good to learn early that the truth about any great object or person cannot be expressed in a few sentences and has not been written down in any little text-book. We must introduce the adolescent into the company of the greatest men, and their company is to be found with their ideas in great literature. To live with the greatest is the very foundation of true education.

There is a need also that we should again examine our teaching of art and music. Thirty years ago music largely consisted of exercises in voice training,

learning tonic sol-fa, a little theory, and a few songs. Many of us remember the listless lessons with their untuneful exercises, or the seemingly never-ending treatment of a single song. Art meant for us pencil drawings of the horrid shapes of specially constructed cones, cubes, and spheres, in the reproduction of which we were supposed to train our eyes and hands, as well as learning something of that most blessed of qualities—perspective.

Recent years, however, have seen great reforms: music has become more enjoyable, and songs have been better chosen and more numerous; art has come to mean free expression for children, with a stress on colour and good design. The gain has been very great. But there is still much to be done, and we can begin by asking if we do enough to help children to enjoy the arts. Ought we not to study and hear far more first-rate music, learn more about orchestras and instruments, and live more frequently in the company of the great composers? Do we help enough people to enjoy music?

Even now in schools where the practice of art is excellent it is not uncommon to find pupils who know nothing of the great painters, of the pictures in the local picture galleries, or even of copies of masterpieces hanging on school walls. We need to spend far more time in teaching children to look at pictures and to enjoy them. We live in a world of wonder of sight and beauty of sound: can we not do more to open boys' eyes and to increase the vision of the race?

The positive approach can be made to science, to social studies, to drama, to crafts. We must win back something of the thrill enjoyed by the little child in these subjects, and give it to our older pupils. Perhaps there must be more experiment, more adventure, even more mistakes, but it will only come from a new emphasis by headmasters, teachers, and leaders of educational thought. The latter seem to be thinking along those lines already, as we find in the recent writings of such men as Mannheim, Jacks, Sir Richard Livingstone, and C. S. Lewis. A new higher end of education can be established, and the negative critical attitude changed into positive creative activity. Sir Richard Livingstone has finely said:

To see the vision of excellence so far as our limitations allow; to get at least a glimpse of the unchanging values of the eternal world as they are revealed in whatever is beautiful and good in the material world of earth; to attempt to make one's infinitesimal contribution toward a society which will embody them more fully than does our own—to do that is to take seriously the tremendous words of Christ: 'Be ye therefore perfect. . . .'

T. B. SHEPHERD

FREDERICK DENISON MAURICE

The Greatest Prophet of the Nineteenth Century

IT WAS 1820 when Southey uttered, in a letter to his friend Coleridge, his estimate of Wesley 'as the most influential mind of the eighteenth century'—a judgement that is likely to stand.

It was 1944 when Dr. Scott Lidgett, on the occasion of his ninetieth birthday, named 'the greatest prophet of the nineteenth century'. Dr. Lidgett is reviewing the formative influences of his life. These are his words:

Then there was Frederick Denison Maurice. You know he was the inspiration of the social work and teaching of Charles Kingsley, whose life, written by his wife in 1887, fed the flames of my own social enthusiasms, and stimulated me to various forms of social activity. The teaching of Maurice clinched all my growing convictions as to the primacy of the Fatherhood of God as revealed in Jesus Christ, in whom was realized the unity of human life—personal and social, spiritual and secular, ecclesiastical and national. The study of Maurice's heroic witness, his fearless application of the truth as he saw it, drew me to him as the greatest prophet of the nineteenth century, a judgement which has never since been shaken.¹

That estimate, too, is likely to be established, as the evidence for it increases. No one, at least, will doubt Dr. Scott Lidgett's qualifications for making it.

It is interesting to compare the words of Dr. Raven² in reference to Maurice:

Let any modern man take the letters of his contemporaries, of Pusey or Bishop Wilberforce, of Manning or Spurgeon, of all, save his younger fellow-prophet, F. W. Robertson,³ and he will feel the difference at once; that they are speaking of things long dead, in the language of an unknown tongue, while Maurice is fresh and full of meaning, a live man among the ghosts. . . . His critics, Froude and Jowett, Mill and Huxley, and Leslie Stephen, as well as those already cited are returning to the dust; Maurice lives and grows.

These are very great tributes, but the greatest of all came from his first tutor in the classics at Cambridge, who later became his brother-in-law, Archdeacon Hare, whose words are quoted by most authorities for Maurice's life. He 'told Mr. Llewellyn Davies that, in his belief, no such mind as Maurice's had been given to the world since Plato's'.⁴ This is a stupendous estimate, but is not to be lightly set aside. R. H. Hutton, who records the conversation, adds on his own account:

There is no doubt that he had more of Plato's eye for discerning the evidence of a supernatural origin of truth, and of the complete incapacity of our minds to originate the highest truths than any Englishman of our century.⁵

¹ *Methodist Recorder*, 10th August 1944.

² *History of Christian Socialism*, pp. 80-1.

³ While himself making this well-deserved exception, R. H. Hutton adds that Robertson was 'greatly Maurice's inferior in theological depth and breadth of historical culture'.

⁴ *apud* R. H. Hutton, *Modern Guides of English Thought*, p. 320.

⁵ *ibid.*

Maurice moved among the greatest men of the Victorian age. Leslie Stephen, by no means a kindred spirit, says he was 'an intellectual leader among his ablest contemporaries, who looked to him with the reverence of a great spiritual leader'.⁶ Gladstone described him as 'indeed a spiritual splendour',⁷ a phrase that crystallizes the impressions of many who knew him intimately.

The fact that Maurice was reserved and diffident in manner makes his great personal influence all the more remarkable. That influence made itself felt at an early age.

When he was still a young man of twenty-five, Arthur Hallam—the subject of Tennyson's *In Memoriam*—wrote to Mr. Gladstone: 'I do not myself know Maurice, but I know many whom he has moulded like a second nature, and these, too, men eminent for intellectual powers, to whom the presence of a commanding spirit would, in other cases, be a signal for rivalry rather than reverential acknowledgement. The effect which he has produced on the minds of many at Cambridge by the single creation of that society of the Apostles' [the Apostles' Club] for the spirit, not the form, was created by him, is far greater than I dare to calculate, and will be felt directly and indirectly in the age that is upon us.'⁸

At the age of 20 he was joint-editor of the *Metropolitan Quarterly*, and at 23 he edited the *Athenæum*.

Dr. Hort (the collaborator of Westcott), writing to Kingsley says:

My somewhat vague impressions were changed by a very interesting conversation with Mr. Maurice (to whom we both owe, I believe, under God nearly all the better part of our being, and not the least the desire, and in part the power, of calling no man master, but learning the truth from the strangest and most dissimilar quarters).⁹

During his great ministry as Chaplain at Lincoln's Inn, which was carried on in addition to an otherwise full life, eminent men came under his spell. Dr. Hort himself was one. Here is part of his account of the service.

His reading of the service was wonderfully beautiful; not a particle of mouthing, but the calmest, solemnest, yet never monotonous prayer. . . . His text was 1 John 1st.¹⁰ Such a sermon, in every respect, I never heard; his quiet, deep voice, piercing you so softly and so firmly through and through, never pausing or relaxing in its strain of eloquence, every syllable weighted with the energy and might of his whole soul (and what a soul!), kept me crouched in a kind of spell, such as I could not have conceived.¹¹

Sometimes the barristers and law students of the Inn were taken along by a friend. One such was R. H. Hutton, himself a gold medallist in philosophy, afterwards one of our greatest essayists, but perhaps best known as editor of the *Spectator* for thirty-six years. After studying under James Martineau, he yielded to the spell of Maurice. Here is the story of that yielding in his own words:

My most intimate friend, Walter Bagehot,¹¹ who was then a student at Lincoln's Inn, took me to hear one of the afternoon sermons of the chaplain of the Inn. I remember

⁶ *Dictionary of National Biography*, Vol. XXXVII, pp. 97ff.

⁷ *apud* J. F. Maurice, *Life of Maurice*, Vol. II, p. 208.

⁸ *apud* R. H. Hutton, *op. cit.*, p. 319.

⁹ A. F. Hort, *Life and Letters of F. G. A. Hort*, Vol. I, p. 184.

¹⁰ *ibid.*, p. 154.

¹¹ The famous authority on the English Constitution and on Finance.

Bagehot, in his cautious way, telling me he would not answer for my being impressed by the sermon, but that at all events he thought I should feel something different went on there, from that which goes on in an ordinary church or chapel service; a sense of 'something religious' (a phrase that Maurice himself would hardly have appreciated) in the air, which was not to be found elsewhere. I went, and it is hardly too much to say that the voice and manner of the preacher have lived in my memory ever since, as no other voice and manner have ever lived with me. . . . There was an intensity—almost too thrilling—something, too, of sad exultation in every tone . . . a personal certainty of the truth, a gratitude that it should be true, and humiliation that it had fallen to such lips as his to declare it.¹²

Kingsley's great debt to Maurice is well known, and has been already mentioned; but a few words of his own may well be quoted:

The most beautiful human soul, whom God, in His mercy, has ever allowed me, most unworthy, to meet upon this earth; the man who, of all men, whom I have ever seen, approaches nearest to my conception of St. John, the Apostle of Love.¹³

This impression of likeness to St. John was not peculiar to Kingsley. It was made on the American clergymen, who having been advised by the vicar of Hammersmith to go and hear Maurice lecture on St. John's Gospel at the Working Men's College, and being asked what they thought of it, replied: 'Oh, it was St. John expounding St. John.'

Two very characteristic, but dissimilar tributes are those of Tom Hughes (author of *Tom Brown's Schooldays*) and Tennyson. Hughes in his breezy fashion declares that he

had gradually come to expect that, in any matter in which he differed from Mr. Maurice, even if it were about the way of making a pair of boots (apropos of the Bootmakers Association, in which both were interested), 'he would be sure afterwards to discover that he had been wrong and Mr. Maurice right'.¹⁴

Tennyson wrote a poem entitled *Frederick Denison Maurice* after Maurice had been deposed from the professorship of theology at King's College, London.¹⁵ To appreciate it we should know that

Tennyson had asked Maurice to be godfather to his son Hallam. Tennyson said he might not live till Hallam was grown up, and if he ever heard his father called an unbeliever, he should like him to be able to say: 'My father asked Mr. Maurice to be my godfather because he was the truest Christian he knew in the world.'¹⁶

These lines from the poem may speak for themselves:

*Come, when no graver cares employ,
Godfather, come and see your boy:
Your presence will be sun in winter,
Making the little one leap for joy.*

¹² *op. cit.*, p. 307.

¹³ *apud* J. F. Maurice, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 555.

¹⁴ *ibid.*, p. 551.

¹⁵ The 'heresy' for which Maurice was deposed is a truism today: that 'Eternal' connotes quality rather than mere duration.

¹⁶ *apud* J. F. Maurice, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 162.

*For, being of that honest few,
Who give the Fiend himself his due,
Should eighty-thousand college-councils
Thunder 'Anathema', friend, at you;*

*Should all our churchmen foam in spite
At you, so careful of the right,
Yet one lay-hearth would give you welcome
(Take it and come) to the Isle of Wight;*

*We might discuss the Northern sin
Which made a selfish war begin;*

*Till you should turn to dearer matters,
Dear to the man that is dear to God;*

*How best to help the slender store,
How mend the dwellings, of the poor;
How gain in life, as life advances,
Valour and charity more and more.*

Of all the tributes to his personal influence, none, perhaps, was more appreciated by Maurice himself than that of his close friend and younger colleague in social work, J. M. Ludlow. Born in India, left fatherless at an early age, educated in France, a brilliant political economist, and a devout Christian, Ludlow was the real founder and driving force of that 'Christian Socialism' of which Maurice has been called 'the prophet'. Speaking in Maurice's presence, Ludlow said:

Without in the least admitting, or thinking, that on the many points in which I have often differed from Mr. Maurice, I must have been wrong and he right, yet as a proof of the reverence which, from long experience of his life I have acquired for him, who, as I never knew a father, is the only man for whom I have ever felt a sense of reverence, I wish here and now to ask his pardon for any words or acts of mine which have given him pain, and to offer him the apologies of a man not much wont to bow the knee to any human authority.¹⁷

Such was the personal influence of the man who drew to himself many of the greatest men of his day. Even those who differed widely from him did not altogether escape the spell. John Stuart Mill is an outstanding instance. The relationship of these two great men would make a fascinating and illuminating study. Maurice speaks of Mill's 'singular equity' and in a warm tribute to his *Logic*, suggests that he was the one man, of his school of thought, who would not deny the possibility, much less scorn, a spiritual experience he has himself never known. Mill's references to Maurice are a revelation—of both men; he says:¹⁸

Although my discussions with Maurice were almost always disputes, I had carried away from them much that helped to build up my new fabric of thought. . . . The

¹⁷ *ibid.*, p. 551.

¹⁸ *Autobiography*, p. 129.

nearest parallel to him was Coleridge, to whom in a mere intellectual point of view, apart from poetic genius, I think him decidedly superior.

This seems to leave no doubt as to which exercised the greater influence on Mill at a critical period of his life. He goes on to say:

I have so great a respect for Maurice's character and purpose, as well as for his great mental gifts, that it is with some unwillingness that I say anything which may seem to place him on a less high eminence than I would gladly be able to accord him. But I have always thought that there was more intellectual power wasted in Maurice than in any other of my contemporaries. Few of them certainly had so much to waste.¹⁹

To really appreciate this unique tribute at its true worth (and incidentally as a measure of the two men) we have only to take Mill's recorded opinion of the Fourth Gospel—that 'it is poor stuff'.²⁰ Now we know what Mill meant by 'waste of intellectual power', and that it is not *Maurice* who is on his judgement. Mill's contrast of himself with Carlyle applies even more strongly in the case of Maurice: 'He was a man of intuition and I was not, and as such . . . it is highly probable that he could see many things which were not visible to me even after they were pointed out.'²¹ It was the tragedy of the century that England listened to Mill rather than to Maurice. Maurice would have made Marx superfluous; Mill made him inevitable.

Though Maurice's learning was vast, he carried it lightly. It never hampered him in grace of speech or action; he used it with the utmost simplicity. Working men by the hundred listened to his lectures, and learned to trust him; many to love him. At a time when the English working class was being swept by anti-Christian propaganda, Maurice was above all men effective in withstanding, if not indeed in turning, the tide.

English, of the English, in the fundamentals of his character, his power of metaphysical thought utterly transcended (while it appreciated) our practical English outlook, and places him among the greatest philosophers of all time. Hobbes and Locke, and Bentham, do not compare with him in breadth of knowledge or depth of spiritual insight. Perhaps the best analogy in our national history is found in Newton; what Newton was in physics, Maurice was in metaphysics, and (as so often among 'the mysterious English') as unexpected. He welcomed the work of scientists and rejoiced, above most, in their discoveries. He said that 'discovery and revelation were more nearly synonymous words than any in our language'.²² But he never dreamed of looking to the physicist or the natural philosopher for evidence that it was neither within their power or their obligation to give. He says:

To demand of a Natural Philosopher that he should detect Justice, Mercy, Benevolence, seems to me a gross impertinence. They are not found in the stars, or in the wings of insects, or amidst geological strata. I rejoice when he rises up against it. I think it is honesty in him to say: 'We cannot pick up divinity or morality on the sea shore, they do not grow amidst any flowers that we have examined.'²³

¹⁹ *ibid.*

²⁰ *Posthumous Essays*, in *loco.*

²¹ *Autobiography*, p. 176.

²² *Moral and Metaphysical Philosophy*, Preface, p. xxi.

²³ *Social Morality*, p. 469.

Maurice himself knew well where they *were* to be found. Would that we had been as wise in more recent days! The physicist has over-stayed his innings, but the crowd loves his 'slogging'; yet there is no reason in the world why the moral or metaphysical philosopher should be overshadowed by the physicist, or have his style cramped by the specialist in science.

What, then, have we been doing with 'the greatest prophet of the nineteenth century' and the greatest of our moral philosophers? Grant that it takes longer for the word of the philosopher to become effective than the work of the evangelist, and the speedier recognition of Wesley's supremacy in the eighteenth than of Maurice's in the nineteenth century. That we have so far failed to take the *measure* of him is sure; that we have so largely failed to take *notice* of him is unpardonable. There are reasons, of course—mostly in ourselves. Had he been a Jew, with a clear-cut ideology; a German with a highly speculative theory; or even as the Scotsman who constructed a '*system* of philosophy that became his prison', we might have taken more notice of him. Even a neat and handy text-book for students—such as we love—might have made him famous; but the most luminous exposition and interpretation of the past, a courageous and challenging witness to the present, leaving an open door (instead of a closed system) into the future, with some light for the way, have passed us by. We are being called to account. For the words of this man have a way of coming to pass.

There have always been some who have suspected that we were missing the message of Maurice. Dr. Hort says:²⁴

Mr Maurice has been a dear friend of mine for twenty-three years, and I have been deeply influenced by his books. To myself it seems that I owe to them chiefly a firm and full hold of the Christian faith; but *they have led me to doubt whether the Christian faith is adequately or purely represented in the accepted doctrines of any school.*

Surely a glorious doubt to implant! Richard Holt Hutton wrote: '*How little did we recognize him here!* And how much, in spite of that lack of recognition, did he effect for us!'²⁵ Dr. Lidgett's words, and Dr. Raven's too, may be read in a similar light.

Between Wesley and Maurice there were fundamental likenesses. Both were clergymen with a Nonconformist ancestry. Both were born leaders. Wesley was the acknowledged leader, though not the founder, of the Holy Club at Oxford; Maurice was the acknowledged leader, though not the founder, of the Apostles' Club at Cambridge. Both were catholic in a truly comprehensive as distinct from the rigid Roman and exclusive sense. It might have been said of either: 'His whole teaching was a protest against the delusion of a redemption through opinions, whether right or wrong, and an assertion of redemption through the life of God incarnate in the nature of man.' A religion of notions, abstractions, propositions was obnoxious to both. 'I believe', said Maurice, 'in nations, not in nationalities, in persons, not in personalities. I avoid popular newspaper phrases, not because I covet abstractions, but because I hate them.'²⁶

²⁴ op. cit., Vol. II, p. 154.

²⁵ op. cit., p. 333.

²⁶ *apud* J. F. Maurice, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 403.

But while Wesley was the soldier, Maurice was the seer; Wesley the prophet evangelist, Maurice the prophet philosopher. How deeply Maurice entered into Wesley's teaching—as distinct from the later Evangelicalism—is seen in his interpretation of Wesley's distinctive witness. His contrast of Wesley (whom he calls 'a judicious person') with Butler (whom he greatly admired as a moral philosopher) is one of the finest ever attempted. The touch is unerring. Having outlined Butler's teaching, he imagines him with his moral order, faced by the Methodist challenge regarding the 'mass of moral disorder in this country of ours'. He considers Butler's possible reaction, and then decides that, whatever Butler may have done about it, by himself and his readers the question must be answered: 'Is not the regenerate man the *true* man, and not the natural man with whom Butler seems to be satisfied?' Butler's moral churchman, in fact, turns out to be Wesley's 'honest pagan'.

Of Methodism, Maurice writes:

The great Methodist Movement to which we had occasion to refer in connection with the philosophic movements of the eighteenth century, had not produced its full results until the nineteenth. Those results coincided in some remarkable points with those of the French Revolution. They had something of the same democratic character. The Methodists went below the third estate. They spoke to the very lowest of the population. In some sense Methodism invested them with a power greater than that which the revolution bestowed on those whom it lifted from the abyss. The influence of preachers and class leaders was of another kind from that which was possessed by the leading spirits of the club; it was not a less real or permanent influence. And the difference lay in this; that those preachers and class leaders spoke to the people of the Infinite and Eternal—declared that a voice had come forth from God to the people.²⁷

He goes on to show that Methodism reached all classes; that its influence spread to those who 'hated Methodism', and aroused them. The above quotation illustrates Maurice's interpretation of life—he recognizes without doubt or misgiving the voice of the Eternal and links the message of that Voice with the deepest needs of human life. The Gospel is good news *from* God; not *about* God.

Wesley's evangel becomes, in Maurice, a philosophy of life. That philosophy is, definitely and unashamedly, Theological. 'For all departments of thought and life he claimed a theological basis, in a Father, revealed in a Son, through the operation of a Spirit, and witnessed to by a Catholic Church.'²⁸

Deeply versed in the philosophies of Hebrews, Persians, Chinese, Hindus, Greeks, Romans, Germans, French, and British, he is not ashamed to turn to the simplicity of the Paternoster. And when the undergraduate protests that 'the Paternoster is taught to the most uncultured, and even to little children,' Maurice replies that it would be 'a peril most to be dreaded' both for himself and his students, 'to be separated from the unlettered man and the little child'. Of course, 'children of all ages were drawn to him', and 'the common people heard him gladly'. Was there not Another of whom such things were said?

One of the most—perhaps it is *the* most—characteristic passage in Maurice's *Philosophy*²⁹ is this:

²⁷ *Moral and Metaphysical Philosophy*, Vol. II, p. 667.

²⁸ *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*, Vol. VIII, p. 500.

²⁹ Vol. II, p. 667.

The idea of a *Creator* may have come forth gradually; the idea of a *Father* is hid in the heart of every child. A revelation that substantiates *that idea*, and makes it the ground of all others, proving it to be human *because* divine, contains a theology which is able to deliver human beings from debasing mythologies, and is opposed to all systems of religion.³⁰

It is clear from this passage, and still more from the context, that Maurice gives first importance to personal relationships, as providing a more sure, and certainly a more intimate, medium of revelation than the external cosmic order. The human heart, even in childhood, cries out for a Father. When Philip said: 'Lord, show us the Father and it sufficeth us', he voiced that very cry. The answer of Jesus is clear and prompt: 'He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father.' The revelation meets the human need.

We are warned that it is at our peril we exchange the idea of a Father for that of 'a mere sovereign, or a mere *Opifex Mundi*'.

God is 'a Father of spirits', and His Fatherhood is fundamental. It is no sentimental Fatherhood derived from weak human analogies. It is before all things—the source of creation and redemption alike, and the sufficient cause of both. It includes, yet transcends, the Righteousness of the Hebrews, the Reality of the Greeks, the Sovereignty of the Romans. It is no symbol drawn from earthly kingdoms, or courts of justice. God is Father. He is 'Father of all' (Ephesians 46).

Maurice writes:

I can say I did not receive this [his faith in Father, Son, and Spirit in a divine fellowship] neither was I taught it. Every glimpse I have of it has come to me through great confusion and darkness. *With* it has come the belief that God has redeemed *mankind*, and that we who are baptized into that family must claim for ourselves the title of sons of God, and must witness to others that they have a claim to it as well as we.³¹

Here is a very characteristic application of this doctrine of the family:

London working men must learn to adopt the daring tone of the Galilean fisherman. They must begin to affirm boldly, 'God has taken us to be His children', seeing we have the nature in which Christ died. It is so, though all the philosophers, all the theological doctors, all the priests, all the rich, all the easy and comfortable people in Christendom suspend their mutual hatreds to affirm: *You*, at all events, are fools; *you* can know nothing.³²

What could be more fitting for today than his widest application of the doctrine of the family?

A more sound international morality . . . necessitates the acknowledgement of such a Father of the whole Family as Christ revealed, of such a Redeemer and centre of Humanity as He is. It seems to me that Englishmen are more likely to be led back into faith by the political road than by the German metaphysical road; though it may be suitable to some minds.³³

³⁰ *Italics* Maurice's.

³¹ *apud* J. F. Maurice, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 16.

³² *Lectures on Epistles of St. John*, p. 311.

³³ *apud* H. F. Hort, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 579.

Some have thought that Maurice was an eclectic. His own word (to his students) is: 'anything but that.' Eclecticism is 'not for the man who is learning to fight and live, it is for those who are compounding a grand system'. And how he hated systems—as the enemies of God and man. He spoke of 'system-mongers'. No system could contain God, but it *could* imprison man, forbidding him to experiment beyond its borders, damning him if he dared to do so, and providing a ready instrument for the heresy-hunter. His own words (spoken of another) may be applied to himself: 'He could find sweetness if it were hanging wild on trees and shrubs; he could admire the elaborate architecture of the cells in which it was stored. Eclecticism in *this* sense seemed only another name for catholic wisdom.'³⁴ Catholic wisdom; that is the word.

'Diffident and vague', was he? Diffident in manner he may have been, for he was both modest and courteous. But vague! Few men have ever been more deeply sure of the foundations of their thought, or more brave to defend them.

But someone will say: 'What about the atonement? Was not Maurice weak on that?'

Maurice's sense of sin was truly profound. In anyone less simple and sincere it would have seemed exaggerated and unreal. It can only be interpreted in the light of his own words: 'I wish to confess the sins of the time as my own.' His friend R. H. Hutton³⁵ says: 'His confessions must be taken as the outpourings of a race rather than of an individual.'

Christ died as the Head of the *Race*, not of a sect. The atonement is an act of God. It avails for *all*. Writing to Kingsley, Maurice says: 'A finished reconciliation and atonement is the one answer to the schemes of man making atonement; if you part with it, all superstitions, all Moloch cruelties, will reproduce themselves.'

Some of Maurice's friends were perplexed; it seemed so unconditional. They looked for conditions of atonement, and expected to have them formulated. Tradition called for it. Maurice appears to have refrained, and to have had little regard for *any* conditions formulated by man. The atonement is of God alone. We neither did nor could contribute one iota to it. It includes all mankind, even the unconscious child. Who are we to formulate conditions and erect fences on the road to the Father's house? Who are we to judge? To 'separate the sheep from the goats', or 'the wheat from the tares'? That is not our task any more than the atonement is our work. After all, what have the various attempts amounted to? Are not most of our interpretations of the atonement the formulation of conditions? Have they helped? Have they not sometimes hindered? Are we proud of the record?

That our own experience of pardon and sonship may be both conscious and joyous is gloriously true. Such experience imposes on us the joyful service of telling others of the Father's love—for *them*.

We may have our terms of fellowship and our forms of service in our particular communion. We *cannot* exclude from the Family of God. Will not the future be with Maurice, even here?

The common life is sacred. Shakespeare and the scientist are both inspired; but the honest journeyman as much as either. To identify inspiration with genius is error; to identify the sacred with the ecclesiastical is folly.

³⁴ *Moral and Metaphysical Philosophy*, Vol. II, p. 315.

³⁵ *op. cit.*, p. 311.

Nationhood, like personal character, is a real attainment and a sacred trust. Nations, like persons, especially the immature, may be selfish. Each nation has its distinctive gift to offer, and all have need of each other. Of his own nation's gift and responsibility, Maurice is not in any doubt. He knows his England as only a great love and a wide wisdom can know her. Her gifts are practical and ethical; her best medium is political. He would not have it otherwise:

There is nothing I desire more than that we should be Englishmen, and not either Scotchmen, Frenchmen, or Germans. . . . We may, I think, be most successful ethical students, in virtue of those practical habits which we always cast aside when we plunge after Frenchmen or Germans into metaphysical speculation. I do not admit for a moment, when I talk of plunging, that they must needs go deeper into spiritual questions than we do; I believe the deepest philosophy is that which lies under the business of life and explains it.³⁶

Writing of Englishmen like Occam, Roger Bacon, and Wyclif, of the fourteenth century, he says: 'For any countryman of ours not to be political, is strange and out of nature.'³⁷

Nationhood was the real force in the English Reformation. English Protestantism is still national rather than religious. In the name of England, Elizabeth ruled over both Catholics and Calvinists, and kept them from destroying each other, and humanity in the process. In France their conflict was fatal; with disastrous results remaining to this day.

'The prophet of Christian Socialism', Maurice was not himself a Socialist. He was just a great Christian, greatly loved and greatly trusted for his wise counsel. The 'isms', or as we call them today, 'ideologies', were not for him. Yet no man was more expert in dealing with them. To speak in metaphor, he had great skill in cracking the ideological nut and taking out its kernel of truth. He was sure to give it just value; but he was just as sure to point out that there were other nuts that owed their life to the same tree. He *never* mistook the nut for the tree.

How one wishes that Maurice could have met Marx! He would certainly have appreciated Marx's honest and laborious contribution to thought; he would have given due weight to the economic argument; but it is more than likely he would have pointed out to Marx one great omission—the fact of nationhood. He would have considered it quite a natural omission in a Jewish thinker, for it was his way to allow for such factors. Then he would have warned Marx that the omitted fact would find him out; that nationhood ignored, would not ignore him; that in Russia, Palestine or elsewhere, it would surely meet him and claim to be heard, and would vindicate its claim. He might have added that an amorphous internationalism, on *any* basis, would be found wanting. Nations, like persons, need to be redeemed, and refuse to be ignored.

As for England—the England of Alfred, of Chaucer, and of Wyclif; of Elizabeth and her famous men; of Hampden, Pym, Cromwell, and Milton; of Bacon and Newton; of Butler and Wesley; these men of experiment in every walk of life—this England, while she remains true to herself, will never, can

³⁶ *apud* A. F. Hort, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 38.

³⁷ *Moral and Metaphysical Philosophy*, Vol. II, p. 6.

never, commit herself to an untried ideology. He would have pointed out that ideologies do not spring from this Island people of experimental history; that they function best as a family; that while the family unites them, 'isms' will divide them. Maurice could never have been content with such phrases as 'toward Community', 'working for Community', 'a decision for sociality'. Instead of such abstractions, he would have called us to accept as a concrete fact, *the actual status of a family*, established for us by the creative act of a Father in a Son. This he held to be the only true conception of the nature of human society. It finds its fulfilment in the redeeming purpose of God. This is a more profoundly revolutionary conception than all isms.

Would he not have found at least some fulfilment of his ideas in the British Commonwealth—this family of free nations—as we see it today? He told us that we are by nature political—that is our gift. Would he not have been justified in pointing out that the basis of unity in the Commonwealth is political; that is, that the greatest measure of unity ever attained by England and her children is not ecclesiastical, but political? He would have hastened to add that it was *not therefore less religious*. How, then, shall an Englishman despise his heritage of ordered freedom, or disparage the instruments of ordered progress?

'Family' and 'Nation' are two great words of Maurice. The whole world today is seeking, and desperately needing, 'A Family of Nations'.

A nation that is herself a family, has become a Mother of Nations; and if faithful to this trust, and reading her destiny aright, she may even be privileged to lead the way to a World-family of Nations whose Father is God. It was on this very note that 'the greatest prophet of the nineteenth century' concludes his greatest written work.³⁸

What of today? Father Hebert speaks³⁹ for a growing number when he acclaim Maurice as 'that seer and prophet of the future whose importance has never yet been fully recognized', and whose teaching 'will form the basis of the constructive theology of the future'. Had Maurice himself some vision that he wrote for a coming day? Speaking of his *Philosophy* (under criticism) he says:

I am quite aware that Oxford doctors will scorn it. I am quite aware that it will find no favour with the Germans, or with our own Liberal schools. Nevertheless I have persevered, having a hope . . . that hereafter, when the name of the author is forgotten, it may assist a few students . . .; may give them hints for tracing, better than I have traced, the relation between the inquirers of one period and another; may cheer them with the thought that a divine teacher has been with men of all ages, and that He will not desert their contemporaries or themselves.⁴⁰

That time has come. *This is Maurice's day!*

When they laid him to rest—offer of burial in the Abbey having been declined by the family—it was a simple funeral such as he would have wished; but the very mixed crowd was so great that it was said that nothing like it had been seen in England since the Duke of Wellington's death.

TOM DRING

³⁸ *ibid.* It is a history of philosophy so luminous that it becomes a *philosophy of history*.

³⁹ *Liturgy and Society*, p. 108.

⁴⁰ *Sequel to 'What is Revelation'*, p. 168.

TOMLINSON OF MYSORE¹

PART TWO

IT IS NOT easy to describe briefly the varied scenes of Tomlinson's life when he was District Evangelist, for over two hundred days a year (especially between 1911 and 1925) were spent under canvas, in travellers' bungalows, and wayside inns.² In their preaching certain topics were tried and tried again. Perhaps the commonest topic was idolatry and the presentation of Christ as the one true image of the invisible God. Tomlinson always tried to avoid anything that was forensic and dogmatic and he would shudder if one of his colleagues tried to explain the death of Christ in the cruder terms of sacrifice and substitution. Nor would he tolerate any preaching which began with 'Believe!' and ended with 'Believe!'. He was assured that St. John (Chapter 15) contained the Gospel for India and tried to make it cover the whole field of preaching. He preached the death of Christ as the result of His union with us and the ground of our union with Him. The Beatitudes were used very often, also St. James's definition of *bhakti* (religion pure and undefiled).

This does not mean to say that the more obvious subjects, such as the parables and acts of our Lord's life, were in any wise neglected. *The Vision of God* and *Is Man a Puppet?* were lines of approach which were explored by Tomlinson and written up as Kanarese hand-bills. The witness of the four different coloured books (Gospels) was another method. They used Hindu mythology to portray Christ as *Dharmarāj* (King of Truth), *Mṛityunjaya* (Conqueror of Death), *Nanjunda* (Swallower of the World's Poison), the conqueror of *Kali Purusha* (Evil One), and the one who will end the *Kali Yuga* (Fourth or Evil Age in which we live).

But in reading through Tomlinson's diary one is not so much interested in the résumés of the sermons prepared and preached, as in the incidents and circumstances which suggested to the preachers some fresh introduction or illustration of their message. As he expressed it in one of his Letters from Camp:

You are just beginning to talk on the nature of true *bhakti*, or devotion, and you overhear a man tell his friend at the back of the crowd that these are the folks who spoil caste, who make all castes one; you have nothing for it but to break off your prepared address and speak on what defiles a man. A little while later a man flings at you the remark that the local god is a being of great *mahimē* (glory). You ask what the particular glory may be, the power to heal the sick, to bless the barren with child, to bring down rain or what? And so you lead on to talk of God as the giver of every good gift and every perfect boon, finishing perhaps with an account of his supreme glory as revealed in Christ, 'full of grace and truth'. There is a Brahmin on the fringe of the group, hard, cynical, superior. He is taking away the attention of the people, so you address him and ask him to let you share in the benefits of his remarks. He does so and tells you that the name of Yēsu Krista is

¹ Concluded from p. 348, October 1947 number.

² His periods of service as District Evangelist were as follows: 1911-15, 1916-19, and 1923-5.

really Krishna spelt differently. . . . You begin to show from a comparison of the two incarnations how radically different is Krishna from Christ. Your Brahmin probably retires . . . and you preach the one incarnation that can save, because it is the one incarnation which reveals God's Holy Love.

As he moved from village to village he would use whatever fell upon his eyes and ears. He used a recent robbery as a starting point to talk about sin (which prompted '*Chi!* They have merely come to find out clues and get information about the robbery. The preaching is a blind'). Salt-makers, goldsmiths, potters, well-sinkers, and sellers of pearls all provided introductions to the appropriate teaching. When he was hauled off the veranda of a temple, in which he had imprudently sat in his boots, Tomlinson was led to discourse upon what defiles a man, and heart purity as the only thing that honours God. When they found themselves camping in a tract of country which had been recently irrigated by a huge reservoir, a frequent subject was '*Rivers of Living Water*'. A picture of Hanumanta, the monkey-god, disporting himself with a woman prompted Shadrach to preach on Christ and the sisters at the grave of Lazarus, and the same story was effectively used to bring comfort to bereaved folk in another village.

In one village he heard the story of how some people were taking a tame deer to another place. On the way it escaped and returned to its home. This led Tomlinson to describe idol worship as not our soul's home. The theme was later developed into '*This world not our place, Christ having come from home to show us the way there*'. While being ferried across a river he learnt how one of the boatman's ancestors had ferried an elephant by means of four boats attached to its legs. Telling this story, Tomlinson preached on the Beatitudes as the four boats to get us across the stream of *karma*, and of Christ as our Able Fordsmen. When the elders of a village excused the lethargy they had shown in moving their village to a more healthy site by saying there was no unity, Tomlinson's diary reads: '*Why no unity?—because of caste. Why caste?—because they do not know God as Father. Then Holy Father and Sinbearer. A very good and straight talk; they stayed till the end.*' In an equally dirty village he saw a filthy pool which he used for a description of the uncleansed pool of idolatry.

Even the frequently punctured two tyres of his bicycle were used to demonstrate the joint necessity of God's help and man's effort on the road to salvation. The festivals of the Hindu year were not without help to the Christian preachers. *Dīpāvali*, the Festival of Lights, and *Yugādi*, the Hindu New Year, provided them with seasonable topics. On New Year's Day Hindus would receive from the temple priest things sweet and bitter. This custom had in it the ingredients of a fine address. The piles of shorn locks and the bald heads of the men and women making their vows at a certain temple was a revolting sight to Tomlinson. But it gave him a starting point from which to preach to these people on the spiritual nature of true worship and the sacrifices required of God.

The use of the magic lantern out of doors in an Indian village is a very common means of evangelism. Tomlinson was never content with showing pictures and making the appropriate explanation. He called it '*Storming the eye-gate*', and to this end a subject was chosen, slides carefully selected, and

the speakers properly briefed. In one lecture the pictures would all answer the question: 'What must I do to be saved?' In another the slides showed: 'The kind of folk Jesus touched' or 'Men Christ reached.' He had a set of slides dealing with idolatry.

The first of these slides showed Christ at the well-side with the woman of Samaria. I told the story briefly in so far as it had to do with spiritual worship, giving it as Indian a setting as I could. Then appeared a picture of an Indian temple followed by one of an idol car undecked. The next slide as of the gaily decorated car being drawn by hundreds of village devotees.

After he had shown slides of several images and idols, and the silence was intense, Tomlinson would urge the question: 'Think you that these can give the sight of the invisible God?' In his telling of the events of the last days of our Lord's life, Tomlinson always tried to show how the pride, greed, stubbornness, and denial, the four sins which the Cross reveals, are also in each one of us. Therefore we slew Him. By word and by picture the band of preachers showed that in Christ's life and death there was the perfect blending of 'grace and truth', two qualities scarcely ever found in harmony among men.

There were many things to encourage and discourage him both from those with whom he worked and from those to whom he preached. 'I always feel on hearing others what a groove I have got into', while of another missionary he wrote: 'I wish I could do the dialogue style of preaching. It is far more effective than my torrents.' 'We have preached better, thanks to Tommy', was the way he expressed again his debt to Edgar W. Thompson. Another who always helped him was the great London Missionary Society preacher—R. A. Hickling. His linguistic and musical gifts allowed him to adapt the Hindu song-service (*kālekshēpam*) method to Christian preaching and encouraged Tomlinson to do the same. The difference between the two preachers was well expressed one day by Hickling: 'When Tomlinson wants to hammer home a point he gives a tap here and a tap there and a tap in the centre and sends it neatly home. I give good slashing blows.'

He also learnt a great deal from his Indian colleagues. It was Shadrach who, in explaining the story of the Prodigal Son, told how the father's hair turned white with grief and anxiety and went on to speak of 'God's whitened hair—the Cross'. Another evangelist extended his interpretation of the same parable to include the pigs which the prodigal fed. They were six in number and each stood for one of the six deadly sins of Indian thought. A convert from Hinduism taught him the impressive stanzas of Basava, the reformer who successfully protested against Brahminism and founded the Lingayat sect. Tomlinson delighted to sing:

*Not by the thread³ comes the New Life,
Men see not God where forms are rife;
Religion pure and undefiled
Cannot with pomps be reconciled;
All vanities of sense eschewed,
Go, worship God in heart renewed.*

³ The Brahmin's sacred thread is here referred to.

He made friends wherever he went. In places this was not necessary because he constantly met his old students or those who remembered him as the brilliant centre-forward when the Bangalore champions won an important tournament. He often revisited places and noted: 'I have got to know the people better and so be at home with them.' At the *jātres* he was amazed and delighted at the range of his acquaintances. Sometimes there would seem to be great spiritual response and, as they drew to the close of another lantern lecture, they saw in Holman Hunt's picture, 'The Light of the World', a picture of Christ himself standing and knocking at the door which covered the hearts of that group of people. There would be significant and impressive incidents as when, while they were showing the picture of Christ blessing the children, a little Indian child got up and tried to put itself in that group of children around Christ.

But these were the phantoms, the mere shadows of a great and glorious triumph, the hope of which sustained them in the face of a great deal of discouragement and constant rebuffs. The ignorance of the village Brahmins was pathetic and their insolence hateful. Said one: 'Don't mention Christ here. We Brahmins need no one to tell us anything of religion.' 'His laughter at things spiritual made me very sad', wrote Tomlinson and, when he tried to correct a man who said that Krishna was above distinctions of right and wrong: 'I felt the strength gone right out of me; this teaching is at the root of all evil.' Rude questions and filthy talk about Christ were unspeakable, the polite scorn of the Lingayats was also hard for him to bear, and even the mild expostulation of an educated Hindu gentleman who said 'We also have our heroes with meekness, etc.' reminded Tomlinson that he had failed to emphasize the living Christ and had tried to please the people by citing in his lecture the Indian qualities in Christ.

The inconclusive debate which followed an English lecture led Tomlinson to write: 'It all led to nothing, but it thoroughly sickened me—very loose thinking and talking and refusal to allow an Englishman to interpret anything of Shankarāchārya while they assumed the power to affirm our interpretation of Christ (e.g. John 10³⁰) was a Christian prejudging.' Even in the village Hindu mind there was, in addition to a purely speculative tendency, far more interest in the origin of evil than in how to find deliverance from it. For instance when Tomlinson was preaching a villager took the turban from the head of the man next to him and demanded: 'Tell me who makes me steal this man's turban?' He meant that God 'the all-pervading is in everything that is done, in evil deeds as well as in good. God does and causes sin; what is man?'

Only those who have been in a pagan, or non-Christian, atmosphere week after week can know its effect on one's spirit, and physically the high standard which Tomlinson expected from himself and his staff naturally led to over-fatigue and disappointments and he was never slow to criticize himself. 'Out of sorts spiritually. Had enough of tour, I think, and short nights', he wrote, and on another occasion: 'These days have had a dispiriting effect on me. I go dispirited too easily.'

Remarkable as were the physical and other efforts expended by Tomlinson, even more amazing, so it seems to me, was the performance of his Indian

colleagues. It is a mistake to think that an Indian bears more easily the heat and burden of an Indian day. It is true that they do and usually smilingly, but at much greater expense to their physical reserves. Sometimes he was vexed because there was too much preamble and no application, and one brother would be long winded while another was too much of a joker, and at other times there was not the passion and urgency he desired. Or perhaps another would relapse into too-Christian phraseology in his explanation of the atonement. But nothing cheered Tomlinson more than the wonderful loyalty, brotherhood, and magnificent work of these four evangelists.

There are many other things which should be mentioned about his camp life. In a moonlight night, on a lonely hill, when the carts had gone on to the next camp and all was quiet, he would spend long periods in prayer and meditation. He read constantly and widely. Sunday was devoted to some important book, and when the writer had noted down all the books mentioned in the diary it made an impressive list. He edited a magazine for preachers—the *Bôdhaka Bôdhini*, and corrected all the proofs. He wrote tracts and completed a masterly *Introduction to the Synoptic Gospels and Commentary on St. Mark's Gospel* in Kanarese, as well as a book of lessons on the life of Christ (*The King of Truth*) both in English and Kanarese. He sent out 'Letters from Camp' to his friends and supporters, and was a prolific writer of personal letters.

On Sundays, if he had not cycled off to the nearest church and congregation, there was always a camp service and where possible Holy Communion, especially if there were any Christians living in the place where they were camping. Wherever he went he always visited the local school and spoke to the children, and in the evenings could be found playing with them. He did sometimes (with shame and misgivings) indulge in an afternoon siesta. Once George saw him in that condition and promptly spread the alarm that he was ill. He travelled long distances on his bicycle at a minimum speed of twelve miles per hour and one hot day did ninety-two miles.

Tomlinson was deeply sensitive to any illness and suffering he saw. Not only did he carry and use a few simple medicines, but also went to great pains to get sick people to the nearest hospital. If he was frustrated in this by an 'if die, let die' attitude he was speechless with grief and anger. Such callousness prompted him to write: 'The pity and needlessness of it all made me scorch because of inward burning. Why did not someone make me do a little medicine fifteen years ago?' It was this that led him to seek the active co-operation of the recently opened mission hospital at Hassan, and many weeks were spent in camps where Dr. C. V. Lowe and her staff healed the sick. Tomlinson and his band preached to the patients and fully exploited the goodwill and interest in the Christian message which these camps created. He showed how in this way they were following in the footsteps of the great *guru*, Jesus, who went about with his disciples healing all manner of diseases.

One of the more obvious ways of speaking about Christ to Hindus is to call him a *guru*, especially in relation to the disciples, for the word signifies a religious teacher, a venerable person, a dispeller of darkness. No one is more venerated by Indians than a *guru*. 'As a string of blind men can only lead one another into the ditch, so without the help of a good *guru* there is no salvation' and 'The *guru* is a step to heaven' were Kanarese proverbs that Tomlinson's

band loved to quote. In his travels he never lost an opportunity of meeting and conversing with them. He saw the *Jagadguru* of Sringeri, a veritable Pope among Brahmins. Another was 'an old seedy-looking, secondhand sort of wholly commonplace man, shabbiness personified, yet the villagers were thronging around him'. Others were rapacious and even vicious. But while the literature of the Karnāṭaka people admitted the frailties of these human *gurus*, it also pointed beyond to an idealized and heavenly *guru*. This is very clearly shown in the stanzas of a Kanarese poet called Sarvagna:

*The tree whose fruits grant all desires is no earthly growth.
The cow of plenty is found in no earthly stall.
No earthly quarry will yield the philosopher's stone—
The supreme guru is not found among men.*

Christ was presented by story after story as the ideal *guru*; an Indian *guru* perhaps, yet how different from the earthly *gurus*, for He welcomed men when they had little to offer Him, washing the feet of His disciples and seeking from them no service for Himself, condescending to touch the outcaste harlot, willing to die rather than hold complicity with evil, the slayer of death, yet united to His disciples today and filling them with new life.

In course of time Tomlinson himself came to be looked upon as a *guru*; unconsciously perhaps he would quote the Kanarese saying that the marks of the *guru* are four—he must know his subject, he must know how to teach it, he must live the truths he teaches, and he must be able to apply these truths to all men everywhere. He little realized how these four marks of a religious teacher were conspicuous in him and how qualified he was to take charge of the Union Kanarese Seminary, Tumkur, an institute which trained evangelists not only for his Church but for other Churches as well. This happened in 1925.

The buildings were quite new, for in 1916 E. W. Thompson had determined that they should be Indian through and through. Much that was desirable in Indian architecture had been used, and had it been possible to give it an Indian name, it might well have been called a Christian *matt*—that is to say the home of a *guru*—a sacred college where he trains his disciples. This is what Tomlinson was eminently suited to do. The course of instruction was entirely in Kanarese and designed to train the type of men who would not only be evangelists, but also the pastors of Christian congregations in towns and villages. In doing this he was bringing to fruition the work of many years. As another missionary said:

Those who were working with the evangelists, before Tomlinson began his long crusade, know well the value of the change he helped to bring. *Best of all he showed preachers that the Four Gospels are essential to our witness.* The kind of address which was made up of . . . passed away.

Or as one of the evangelists wrote:

Even today his addresses are examples to us. *First of all he showed very clearly the way to teach about the Cross of Christ.* . . . Before we did not teach in a way that touched the hearts of sinners or influenced their souls, but we learnt from this great soldier

of the Cross how to teach these important things in a way that appealed to their hearts. Nobody can deny this.

His work at the Seminary came to a fitting climax when in 1932 he built the chapel in *Chālukyan* style, a common and beautiful feature of Mysore temple architecture. The result was a building which was unmistakably Indian and yet quite unmistakably Christian. There could be no more fitting testimony to Tomlinson's life work than this church. Its cruciform chancel window contained in its wooden tracery the inspiration and theme of so many of his sermons—our Lord's allegory of the vine and its branches.

Tomlinson was now fifty-five and, looking back, one wishes that he could have had many more years as a teacher. But Sawday was about to retire from the active work and it was felt that Tomlinson was the only person who could administer his many-sided activities in and around Mysore City, and this he did for two and a half years (1932-5). After a final furlough in England he acted for a year as Chairman of the District, and returned in 1937 to Mysore City for a period of service which was to terminate with his death in 1944. If a biography is ever written there would have to be some account of the distinguished work he did as a missionary deputation while on furlough, of how he went for two years to the west coast of India to help to administer the work of the Basel Mission at the close of the 1914-18 War, something of his work as a reviser of the Kanarese Bible, the story of the rise of the Church Union movement in Southern India, and Tomlinson's work on the Joint Union Committee (in the advocacy of Church Union his last sermon was preached), and the striking contribution made by him at the great Mārāmon Conventions of the Mar Thoma Church in Travancore.

For these last seven years in India he was at the Wesley Press, Mysore City, in charge of Kanarese literature and editor of the *Vrittanta Patrike*, a Kanarese weekly paper. During the first year he was hopelessly overburdened, for he also had financial responsibility for a great deal of other mission work, and perhaps he did not realize in what deep waters the *Vrittanta Patrike* stood. Truly it had been sinking for several years and the reserve fund, which in 1930 had been 6,200 rupees was only 1,492 rupees in 1937, and a year later there was a large and growing debt. When the war broke out and the price of newsprint jumped, it needed all the generosity of Tomlinson and his friends to keep the debt from reaching a really alarming figure.

When the *Patrike* was started in 1887 by the Rev. Henry Haigh there was no vernacular paper circulating in the villages, and it at once achieved success among the educated people of small towns and villages. Its value was obvious, for it linked Christianity with the common life of the people. It greatly encouraged the small Christian communities and lonely evangelists, through whom it was distributed and excellent local information obtained. Through its leading article it dealt frankly with the dominant interests of the hour, and this was of great value in war years. Through its religious article it pointed definitely to Christ as the true satisfaction of men's needs. The circulation, however, had been seriously affected by the rise of three or four Kanarese daily papers.

It was naturally hoped that the Missionary Committee would intervene and

save from extinction such a unique and valuable Christian witness. Some additional help to that of the salary of a missionary and an Indian evangelist was sorely needed to save the paper. In fact, that such a fate should befall the *Vrittanta Patrike* was almost unthinkable. But when things were reaching their climax in 1941 the District was visited by a commission appointed by the South India Provincial Synod of the Methodist Church. A similar commission had visited other districts and had formed, and perhaps was obsessed by, certain doctrinaire conclusions. It is true that some of the members came from districts where the whole policy of their work was directed to the aiding of great mass movements, and they felt that, judged by these standards, the *Vrittanta Patrike* was not effective. Nevertheless, it decided to recommend the Home Committee to give to the paper an emergency grant of £100 for two years, but imposed conditions which Tomlinson believed to be impossible of fulfilment. This commission had, of course, come in a purely advisory capacity, but its resolutions so weighted the load of debt and anxiety that it was decided to 'close down'. Since the last number of the *Vrittanta Patrike* was issued on Christmas Day 1941 there fell to poor Tomlinson the melancholy task of bidding his readers a Happy Christmas and Farewell!

Although Tomlinson did not look on all this as really the Lord's doing, he loyally accepted what had happened and it was not very long before a brighter day began to dawn. First of all the scheme to amalgamate the Wesley Press, Mysore, with the Christian Literature Society, Madras, released money to finance the production of Christian books, and Tomlinson was able to write: 'Good is really coming from the "disaster" of the loss of the *Patrike*.' He therefore postponed his furlough till 1944. Secondly, a Kanarese Christian Council was formed and he still further delayed his furlough so as to see through the long-hoped-for scheme which would make his appointment the centre of a board to produce Kanarese Christian literature for all the churches and missions in the area. In 1944 he was able to write to his friends: 'You will be glad to see how out of what looked like a tragedy in the loss of the paper there has come a new beginning in a scheme of co-operative work in the production of Christian books in Kanarese.' When he wrote this in April 1944 he had apparently recovered from a severe attack of pneumonia, and had begun to write for the Department of Missions at the Selly Oak Colleges, a book (and completed three chapters) which would systematize what he had been preaching all those years in the villages of India.

His death on the 29th August 1944 came with shattering suddenness and it is perhaps too early to write the final word. For in the story of his life and work there is something that is reminiscent of the brave deeds which have happened in this and the previous war—someone would decide that the time had come to exploit a break-through and order the cavalry or the paratroops into the gap; but there hadn't been a break-through and there wasn't a gap.

So in judging what Tomlinson's crusade achieved we must remember that, even after one hundred years, we are still perhaps only at the outset of a great modern missionary movement in India. Christian men and women, first from far-off lands, and then from India herself, have succeeded and will still further succeed in changing thought patterns and psychological sentiments so that Christian truths may be understood and received, though not to the fullest

degree in our own generation. But to his colleagues and the Indian Church his example and friendship was in itself a tremendous urge to attain in a land, where constancy of endeavour is one of the most difficult of Christian tasks, 'the stature of the full-grown man in Christ Jesus'.

The book found open on his desk after his death was Otto's *The Idea of the Holy*. In Tomlinson there were many aspects of holiness which made special appeal to the Indian Church. Let one of his students speak:

As a boy I saw him slowly moving from the vestry toward the pulpit. His head was covered with shining hair. His face was glorious. He passed into the pulpit—his face was sunk into the palms of his hands. When it was lifted up it was to us boys as if we had seen an angel's face. . . . Once we saw him in the seminary bungalow praying about 2 o'clock in the night. I believe that in the day-time he lived in this world, and at night he lived in another with his Master.

Or as a beloved Indian Colleague spoke in a memorial service at Tumkur: 'He made our country his mother country, he counted our people as his own, he laid down his life in our midst, and we can never forget him.'

N. CARR SARGANT

Notes and Discussions

'THE BIBLE TODAY'

THIS IS the unpretentious title of a series of seven 'open lectures' by the Norris-Hulse Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge, addressed to students on the character of the Bible and forms an exceedingly valuable introduction to it. We wish it could be introduced into the study of our young local preachers, and the teachers of senior classes in our Sunday schools. It regards the Bible as a history of a continuous community, clan, nation, 'dispersion', and catholic Church, in which God revealed Himself through chosen men, prophets, who were able to observe God moving in history, revealing to men His will, and using these men to move from one stage to another in moral and spiritual understanding, and causing them to reject false and cruel laws and usages and to march onward to the perfect teaching and example of our Lord and His Apostles in the Christian Church. Very vividly does he portray the cardinal position of the prophets as interpreters of history and religious experience: the call of Abraham and Moses, and the wonderful codification of the Law, Psalms, Wisdom Literature, and Apocalypses of the Old Testament, and the imperfection and inconclusiveness of the Old Testament as it moves forward to the 'great divine event' in the emergence of our Lord and His Apostles in the Christian Church. Each stage was of the nature of an 'agreement' or 'covenant' involving promise on God's part and obedient fulfilment on His people's, till the final stage is reached in the promise of the new heart and the perfect obedience involved in the Divine Law of Love revealed by the Lord Jesus and manifested in the moral energy imparted by the special gift of the Holy Spirit. Pentecost crowns the process of revelation, and guarantees the fulfilment of the covenant on God's part; and in the death of Jesus and the death of the first martyrs our redemption is sealed and our sanctification exposed as a visible fact. St. James and St. Stephen reveal the absolute obedience and as absolute love of the Saviour and His men, praying God to forgive their enemies.

History is revealed as a progressive revelation of God and the fact of the great prophets having a real encounter with God is insisted upon, and this encounter found its triumphant example and fulfilment in Christ the Word of God, the final revelation and the antecedent to Final Judgement. Of old, progressive revelation had its successive acts of judgement in the evolution of Israel's history, and judgement preceded renewal and a fresh start in the nation's progress, and now in the Church the same role is being played. The functions of the Gospel and the Sacrament with all they imply is to prepare for the Manifestation of the Kingdom of God in its final and enduring form.

The supreme value of the experience of the saints in the Psalms as a source of comfort and strength for believers in all ages is insisted on, maugre the instances of a low level of knowledge and even a false view of duty at times. The

¹ Professor C. H. Dodd (Cambridge University Press), 7s. 6d.

times of ignorance God winked at as Paul insisted, and we should do the same overlooking, condemning utterly the 'ban' of man, woman, child, and beast as instances of savage iniquity in a misapprehending heathenism that knew not the real will of God, and through fear took means to prevent the future holocaust of their descendants. Cromwell at Drogheda and the inflictors of Saint Bartholomew's slaughter were equally to be condemned in New Testament times.

The sanity of the lecturer is very noble and frank. In regard to the structure of the Scriptures and the possible time and conditions of their being brought together, Professor Dodd takes the usual view of the judges whose knowledge of history and language is the more perfect. The thorough knowledge of the Hebrew Bible and the Septuagint translation, as well as the new history of the Babylonian and Assyrian Empires as revealed by the Ur excavations, all this has materially altered ancient views. As for instance, the impression conveyed by an Ur tablet dated two hundred years before the supposed birth of Abraham, bears witness to a high civilization, artistic and beautiful writing; and the reputed nomadic sheik of Milman is found to hail from a very highly finished city, with its aquamarines very possibly hailing from South India. But this must have end. We commend this book at 7s. 6d. as a very cheap introduction to the Bible, of the best scholarship combined with a deep sense of religion, as Butler would say: no patter, and deep reverence.

JAMES LEWIS

DID SHAKESPEARE READ AESCHYLUS?

I

SOME YEARS ago when reading the *Choephori* of Aeschylus, I found that again and again I was reminded of *Macbeth*. More recently I have been looking into the coincidences I noted down at the time, to see if there actually was any connexion. Some of them have been abandoned on closer examination, and a few others have been added. I should like to draw attention to the following.¹

(1) *Choephori*, 70ff.:

So, though all means go streaming in one course to purge the blood from a hand polluted, yet do they strive in vain.

(On the word 'means' Tucker points out that the sense 'expedients' is blent with that of 'streams').

Macbeth, Act ii.2.61:

*Will all great Neptune's ocean wash this blood
Clean from my hand?*

¹ The renderings are taken from T. G. Tucker's fine edition of the *Choephori*, by kind permission of Cambridge University Press.

Compare too the washing of a polluted hand in Act v.1 (lines 29ff.), the sleep-walking scene.

(2) *Choephoroi*, 400ff.:

Nay, the law goeth that drops of life-blood shed to the ground demand yet other blood.

Macbeth, iii.4.122:

It will have blood, they say; blood will have blood.

(3) *Choephoroi*, 521ff.:

'Twas with a heart quaking at dreams and night-wandering alarms that the impious woman sent these offerings. . . . Then she screamed in her sleep and woke aghast, and about the house many a lamp, whose light the dark had quenched, sprang up again for the mistress' sake.

Again we are reminded of Lady Macbeth's sleep-walking; also the words of Macbeth himself (iii.2.17ff.):

and sleep
In the affliction of these terrible dreams
That shake us nightly. Better be with the dead . . .
Than on the torture of the mind to lie
In restless ecstasy.

(4) Both plays contain, at a dramatic moment, repeated knockings at a door, in both cases the door of a murderer. In both cases it is the knocking of Nemesis—the person who knocks (Orestes and Macduff respectively) later slays the murderer.

Choephoroi, 649ff.:

ORESTES: *Ho there! Ho there! Hear the knocking at your outer door! Ho there! Ho there! Once more! Who is at home within? I call a third time for someone to come forth, if Aegisthus permits the house to give the stranger welcome.*

SERVANT: *Aye, aye; I hear. Of what country is he who visits, and from whence?*

Macbeth:

It is sufficient to remark here: 'I pray you, remember the porter' (ii.3.24).

(5) Immediately following the door-knocking in the *Choephoroi* we have (656ff.):

and make haste; for the car of Night is pressing on with darkness, and it is time for travellers to let go anchor in the inns that house the stranger.

cf. *Macbeth*, iii.3.6:

Now spurs the lated traveller apace
To gain the timely inn.

In both these passages the subject is advancing night; both refer to the inn and the traveller; both contain a reference to speed—'pressing on', 'spurs'—though in Aeschylus it is the night which presses on.

(6) After Orestes has slain Aegisthus and Clytemnestra he sees phantoms invisible to the rest. Exactly the same thing happens to Macbeth after he has slain Duncan. Both are assured there is nothing there, it is imagination.

Choephoroi, 1046ff.:

ORESTES: *Ah! Ah! Ye serving-women, see them yonder, in dusky gowns, and coiled o'er with swarming snakes, like Gorgons! No more tarrying for me!*

CHORUS: *What fancies are tossing thee, thou father's true son, if ever such there was? Stay; have no fear; thy victory is great.*

ORESTES: *To me these visitations are no fancies. Without a doubt you are the angry sleuth hounds of my mother.*

CHORUS: *'Tis that the blood is still fresh upon thy hands.*

Macbeth, iii.4 (the whole scene). The ghost of Banquo appears at the feast, but only Macbeth sees this fearful apparition (lines 40ff.). Lady Macbeth assures him:

This is the very painting of your fear . . . you look but on a stool (lines 61-8).

(7) Lady Macbeth has often been compared with Clytemnestra. The following curious coincidence may be mentioned; though both are murderers, they recall from earlier days the tender offices of motherhood.

Choephoroi, 895ff.:

Have pity, child, upon this breast whereat so oft slumbering the while, thou didst suck forth with toothless gums the good milk that nourished thee.

Macbeth, i.7-54ff.:

*I have given suck, and know
How tender 'tis to love the babe that milks me:
I would, while it was smiling in my face,
Have plucked my nipple from his boneless gums . . . etc.*

(8) The murderers Aegisthus² and Macbeth both find that honour is replaced by fear as far as their subjects and servants are concerned.

Choephoroi, 52ff.:

The reverence that of yore none could withstand or overcome or challenge, that filled the people's ear and searched its heart, now casts allegiance off. But fear men have.

Macbeth, v.3.24:

*And that which should accompany old age,
As honour, love, obedience, troops of friends,
I must not look to have; but, in their stead,
Curses, not loud but deep, mouth-honour, breath,
Which the poor heart would fain deny, and dare not.*

cf. v.2.19:

*Those he commands move only in command,
Nothing in love.*

Many lists of parallels between Shakespeare and the classics have been drawn up, mostly of a very inconclusive nature; but the above are all concerned with

¹ Clytemnestra was the actual murderer but Aegisthus was her accomplice.

one ancient tragedy and one play of Shakespeare. They would seem therefore to make a stronger case for the view that Shakespeare had some acquaintance with the Greek drama. The fact that *Macbeth* is the play involved is of interest, for on other grounds this has been regarded as the most Greek of all his plays. John Drinkwater writes in his *Outline of Literature*:

In *Macbeth*, unusually for Shakespeare, Duncan is killed in the Greek manner 'off' the stage. *Macbeth*, in fact, in its earlier scenes and in its emotional context represents more closely than any other of Shakespeare's plays the Greek way of handling a subject.

Confer H. Buechler: *Macbeth* 'trotz aller Verschiedenheit der Formen ganz nach dem Systeme der alten Tragödie geschrieben ist.'³

A few passages from the *Choephoroi* which remind us of other plays of Shakespeare may be mentioned.

(9) *Choephoroi*, 313:

a thrice-old-man proverb.

Romeo and Juliet, i.4.37:

proverb'd with a grandsire phrase.

(10) The Nurse makes a brief appearance in the *Choephoroi* (747ff.), but as Tucker remarks she may be compared with Shakespeare's Nurse in *Romeo and Juliet*. Tucker says that here Aeschylus is romantic, not classical. We have the same garrulity, the same attitude to the youngster she has nursed—she recalls attending to the baby Orestes in the night, but after all these infants are not to be blamed, for they cannot express their wants!

On this point, however, it can be said definitely that Shakespeare's Nurse does not come from this source in spite of striking resemblances. A. Broke's poem, *Romeus and Juliet* (1562), was the main source of Shakespeare's play and the Nurse is unmistakably taken over entire; her innocent grossness, her exasperating delay in getting to the point after her return from Romeo—all are in Broke's poem.⁴

(11) *Choephoroi*, 379:

This went right through my ear like a dart.

Hamlet iii.4.95:

These words like daggers enter in mine ears.

(12) In the *Choephoroi* and in *Hamlet* there is the same reference to the burial of the murdered king without the due rites—a three-fold negative being used in each case.

Choephoroi, 435ff.:

With an enemy's burial didst thou bury him; the King without his people, without dying rites; thine husband without a tear.

Hamlet, i.5.77:

unhousel'd, disappointed, unanel'd.

³ *Shakespeare's Dramen in ihren Verhältnisse zur Griechischen Tragödie* (1856).

⁴ See P. A. Daniel's edition (1875).

(13) Here is a very interesting coincidence. Some months ago a talk was given on the wireless on the murder of Hamlet's father; the speaker described this as the perfect crime as it would leave no trace of its cause. Hebona (*hebenon*), he maintained, should be henbane, which would have precisely these effects. Now the effects are described with the words (i.5.64):

*The leperous distilment . . .
And a most instant tetter bark'd about,
Most lazarus-like, with vile and loathsome crust,
All my smooth body.*

I was greatly surprised to find a few days later a passage in the *Choephori* which previously had not attracted my attention (277ff.):

tettors that climb with cruel jaws along the flesh, eating away its olden nature—and how upon the plague a white down grows and grows.

The same leprous condition is being described.⁵ The word 'tetter' is in the Greek '*leichen*', a lichen-like eruption, a medical term suggested by its other meaning 'tree-moss'—it is our word 'lichen'.⁶

The preceding words in the *Choephori* show that this is a threat of the kind of affliction which will come to Orestes if he does not avenge his murdered father. The very words 'how to appease anger from under the earth' remind us of Hamlet.

(14) Another link with Hamlet is provided by *Choephori*, 268ff.:

The mighty oracle of Loxias cannot play false, when it bids me face this peril to the end, and, with urgent voice and loud, utters a freezing tale of woes to make the hot heart shudder, if I avenge not my father on the guilty, like for like.

Apart from the main theme of this passage, a commission to avenge a murdered father, the 'freezing tale of woes' which makes 'the hot heart shudder' reminds us forcibly of

Hamlet, i.5.15:

*I could a tale unfold whose lightest word
Would harrow up thy soul, freeze thy young blood . . . etc.⁷*

Hamlet's doubts as to the reliability of the ghostly commission and his suspicion that he may be deceived by some evil spirit may again be paralleled in the *Choephori*: 'Shall I, or not, have trust in oracles like these? Even if I have not trust, the deed must still be done.' Many more parallels could be adduced from this play and the *Choephori*. The theme is the same. Orestes' father, Agamemnon, has been murdered; his murderer, Aegisthus, has married the widow, Clytemnestra; Orestes is commissioned to slay Aegisthus. This is precisely the *Hamlet* plot; Hamlet's father has been murdered; his murderer, Claudius, has married the widow; Hamlet is commissioned to slay Claudius.

Now the question immediately arises: Were the plays of Aeschylus accessible in English in Shakespeare's day? We know that he read Golding's *Ovid*, Phaer's

⁵ For the white hair or down as an indication of leprosy, see Leviticus 13^{3,20}.

⁶ cf. the reference in *Hamlet* to the smooth body being 'bark'd about' with a loathsome crust.

⁷ The Ghost is of course here referring to his own purgatorial discipline in the underworld, while Orestes is thinking of this same penalty as a threat to himself.

Virgil, North's *Plutarch*, Chapman's *Homer*—but what of Aeschylus? The answer to this is that no translation into English had been made at that time. In the light of Ben Jonson's words, 'though thou had'st small Latin and less Greek', it would seem precarious to suppose that Shakespeare was able to read the play in the original, particularly in view of the great difficulty of Aeschylus's gorgeous and involved language. Are we then to dismiss such parallels as pure coincidences?

Gilbert Murray in a deeply interesting chapter on Hamlet and Orestes in his '*Classical Tradition in Poetry*'⁸ draws out a number of parallels both in the main features of the plot and in incidental details; but he takes into account seven Greek plays in which Orestes figures (Aeschylus's *Agamemnon*, *Choephoroi*, and *Eumenides*—these three, of course, form the *Oresteia*, the only extant trilogy; Sophocles' *Electra*; Euripides' *Electra*, *Orestes*, and *Andromache*), and his survey includes in addition to Shakespeare's play its forerunners, particularly the story in Saxo Grammaticus and the Icelandic *Ambales Saga*. We are mainly interested at the moment in the coincidences between Shakespeare and the Greek plays, especially Aeschylus; and among very many others he notes the following. Hamlet and Orestes were both addicted to soliloquies;⁹ they have doubts and hesitations; they are under the shadow of madness; they have a faithful friend, and so on. After one series of striking parallels Murray writes: 'In all these strangely characteristic speeches of Orestes, every line might have been spoken by Hamlet.' 'What is the connexion?' he asks; and goes on:

All critics seem to be agreed that Shakespeare did not study these Greek tragedians directly. And, if anyone should suggest that he did, there are many considerations which would, I think, make that hypothesis unserviceable. Of course, it is likely enough that some of Shakespeare's university friends, who knew Greek, may have told him in conversation of various stories or scenes or effects in Greek plays.

But for his final answer Murray turns to the primitive religious rituals on which the dramas were ultimately based. The drama of Orestes-Hamlet goes back to the Vegetation-kings or Year-daemons; the Year-king comes as a wintry slayer, weds the Queen (Mother Earth), grows proud and royal, and then is slain by the Avenger of his predecessor. This deep-seated myth lies behind the story of Orestes and Hamlet, and playwrights of genius independently work out in similar ways the dramatic possibilities latent in the original seed.

He does not deny that real history may lie behind the dramas, but points out that there was a tendency for true traditions to coalesce with the old nature-myths, and definite evidence for the present instance is given. Thus in Saxo Hamlet is son of Horvendillus, an ancient Teutonic god connected with dawn and the spring. Murray quotes Bradley's words about Gertrude's soft, animal nature; 'she loved to be happy like a sheep in the sun and . . . she loved to see others happy.' He adds: 'Just the right character for our Mother Earth! For, of course, that is who she is.' The old myths are at times altered and transformed.

Yet some inherent quality still remains, and significant details are repeated quite unconsciously by generation after generation of poets. Nay more . . . often there

⁸ Oxford University Press (1927).

⁹ *Choephoroi*, 268-305.

is latent in some primitive myth a wealth of detailed drama, waiting only for the dramatist of genius to discover it and draw it forth.¹⁰

One cannot help feeling that the astonishing comparisons which are built up so impressively hardly seem to be adequately accounted for by the explanation given. And even if we could explain the case of Hamlet in this way, it would not apply to the parallels pointed out above between *Macbeth* and the *Choephori*, as the story of Macbeth has no connexion with the Orestes saga.

II

In order to view the matter in its true perspective, the wider question of Shakespeare's classical knowledge must be looked at briefly. The prevailing view appears to be that he was almost entirely restricted to the English translations.

The brief but decisive essay of Richard Farmer (*Essay on the learning of Shakespeare*, 1767) successfully demolished various attempts which had been made earlier to show that Shakespeare had a wide knowledge of the original Greek and Latin classics. Farmer proved that practically all the evidence which had been brought forward could be accounted for by the English versions. His essay is a vigorous piece of work and he drives his arguments home with humour and punch. Again and again he is able to prove that in passages where Shakespeare is quoting or referring to the classics it is demonstrable that he used the English translations, not the originals. One example of the kind of proof he uses may be given.

Antony and Cleopatra, iii.6.8ff.:

Unto her
He gave the 'stablishment of Egypt, made her
Of lower Syria, Cyprus, Lydia,
Absolute queen.

This should obviously be Libya, which was what Plutarch wrote in his *Lives*. Now North's translation has Lydia, and it is clear that Shakespeare was working on the basis of North and perpetuated the error.¹¹ Farmer, however, while successfully disposing of the bulk of the parallels brought forward by Upton and others, overstated his case. It can be shown that Shakespeare did consult the original Latin at times, even when using an English rendering. For example, it was quite right to point out that the passage in the *Tempest* (v.1) which begins: 'Ye elves of hills, brooks, standing lakes and groves', was derived from Golding's translation of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (Book vii): 'Ye ayres and winds, ye elves of hills, of brookes, of woodes alone.' But it was shown by J. C. Collins in the *Fortnightly Review* for 1903 that 'there is nothing in Golding corresponding to the original in "*sua convulsaque robora terra*", which he omits entirely, but Shakespeare accurately recalls it in "*rifted Jove's stout oak*."'

Collins, in a series of articles, answered with a confident affirmative the question posed in his title: 'Had Shakespeare read the Greek tragedians?' He

¹⁰ This fascinating study of the persistence of certain themes has been followed up by Maud Bodkin along psychological lines in her *Archetypal Patterns in Poetry*, 1934.

¹¹ North actually translated from the French version of Amyot, not from the original.

contended that Jonson's disparaging reference to Shakespeare's classical attainments was fixed by such standards as would apply to an Erasmus or a Casaubon. Shakespeare alone of the great poets and dramatists of the time had not been to a university. The academic party consequently regarded him with pedantic jealousy. (How knoweth this man letters having never learned?) Collins himself maintained that Shakespeare could read Latin fluently and 'of the Greek classics in the Latin versions he had, in all probability, a remarkably extensive knowledge'.

At one point Collins deals with the question of Shakespeare's education, following up an inquiry opened by Spencer Baynes. The wide knowledge of Greek in the universities at that period presupposes the teaching of Greek in the Grammar Schools to prepare for the university training. But did this apply to Stratford Grammar School where in all probability Shakespeare received his education? That, replies Collins, would depend on the headmaster. Now, the head when Shakespeare entered the school was Walter Roche, who had been a Fellow of Corpus, Oxford. Corpus was the first college in which Greek was taught, and there is thus every likelihood that Greek was included in the curriculum at Stratford. Collins also refers to two Latin letters of this period written by *alumni* of the Stratford School; these show considerable knowledge of idiom and vocabulary, and illustrate the high standard which the school inculcated.¹² While Collins says that Shakespeare 'must have left school with a competent knowledge of Latin and, it may be, fairly or even well grounded in Greek' he nevertheless puts all his weight on Latin, of which he feels more sure. Many of the great Greek masterpieces were available in Latin translations, and so it was not necessary to know Greek in order to have a wide acquaintance with Greek literature.¹³

Collins claims to find links with Sophocles and Euripides. In connexion with Aeschylus he refers to the Latin translation by Sanravius, and suggests that Shakespeare could easily have become acquainted with the seven extant plays by means of it.¹⁴ I have consulted this Latin version, which was published in 1555 at Basle, to see if it had any light to throw on the question of *Macbeth* and the *Choephori*—with disappointing results. In the particular passages which I have examined Shakespeare appears to be nearer to the Greek than the Latin; so that if there really was a connexion of some kind Sanravius was not the bridge. In the case of (1) above, the reference to the hand disappears. The Greek mentions the hand in an adjective—'hand-defiling'. Sanravius translates 'odiosam'.

Collins gives evidence that other Greek writings in addition to the tragedies were drawn upon by Shakespeare. Thus in *Troilus and Cressida* iii.3 (92ff.), Ulysses is found reading in the Grecian camp. 'What are you reading?' asks

¹² J. Dover Wilson shows that R. Willis, who was born like Shakespeare in 1564 and like him received only a Grammar School education, became secretary to the Chancellor of the Exchequer (*Life in Shakespeare's England*, 1911, page 63).

¹³ Ascham in his '*Scholemaster*' (1570) mentions with some severity the remark of a Bishop: 'We have no nede now of the Greeke tong, when all thinges be translated into Latin.'

¹⁴ The title mentions six tragedies of Aeschylus, but this is because the *Agamemnon* and the *Choephori* are regarded as one play. It may be recalled that in the Greek MSS. the opening of the *Choephori* is missing; this may explain why it became attached to the *Agamemnon*, of which it is the sequel. In modern editions the opening lines have been restored from Aristophanes' *Frogs*—from the famous dispute between Aeschylus and Euripides in Hades.

Achilles. The discussion which follows shows that the book must have been Plato's dialogue *I Alcibiades*.¹⁸ No one, says Collins, had previously noticed this. The dialogues were not at that time in English, though various Latin translations were available (e.g. Ficino). He does not mention the interesting point that Aristotle is mentioned, this time by name, in the same play. In Act ii.2 (166f.) Hector refers to 'young men, whom Aristotle thought Unfit to hear moral philosophy'. The reference is to the Nicomachean *Ethics* (I.3.5-8). Sir A. Grant in his commentary on the *Ethics* writes: 'Shakespeare had seen the passage quoted somewhere.' (The fearful anachronism of both references will be observed; evidently the Trojans were as interested as the Greeks in the philosophy which was to be produced some centuries later!) Admittedly brief references of this kind do not establish direct acquaintance, but they do show that Shakespeare's knowledge of Greek literature extended beyond Chapman's Homer.

Robert K. Root's *Classical Mythology in Shakespeare* ('Yale Studies in English', No. 19) appeared the same year, 1903, as Collins's three articles in the *Fortnightly Review*. He showed that the two predominant sources for the mythology were *Ovid* and *Virgil*, mainly the former. Shakespeare read these in the English versions of Golding and Phaer; but he consulted the Latin original of *Virgil*¹⁹ and probably *Ovid* too. Chapman's version of the *Iliad* must be included for the case of *Troilus and Cressida*, but 'of any other Greek influence there is not the slightest hint'. He continues:

Mr. John Churton Collins, in a series of articles in the *Fortnightly* for 1903, has tried to show that Shakespeare was familiar with the Greek dramatists in Latin translations. At the time of going to Press, the last article of his series has not yet appeared; but in the articles already published I find no evidence sufficient to overthrow my own belief that he was totally unacquainted with them.

It appears to be agreed that Shakespeare had sufficient Latin at least to consult the original text and that in certain cases he did so. Collins establishes the possibility that he was well-grounded in Greek but makes no use of it, relying entirely on the Latin versions. And it is extremely difficult to prove that Shakespeare ever consulted the Greek of any passage. M. Van Doren's *Anthology of World Poetry* includes him among the translators of the Greek Anthology and quotes the epitaph on Timon by Callimachus. But before we rush to the conclusion that he translated this from the Greek, several factors have to be remembered: (a) *Timon of Athens* is not of solely Shakespearian authorship, (b) the Greek Anthology existed in a Latin translation (at least in part); but these two points are quite immaterial because (c) the epitaph occurs in North's *Plutarch* in the life of Antony, one of the sources of the play.

III

We have thus not reached any definite answer to our question, and the problem raised by our dozen parallels (all of them from the *Choephoroi*) remains. Are they all, particularly those which pair with *Macbeth*, to be regarded as due to

¹⁸ This dialogue is probably not by Plato (see A. E. Taylor's *Plato*, p. 522), but that is beside the point.

¹⁹ Root cites the word 'Phrygian' in the *Rape of Lucrece* (line 1502), a word which is not in Phaer's *Virgil*. Shakespeare must have derived it from the original Latin of the *Aeneid* (ii.68).

chance? No doubt a rigorous scrutiny of the passages would result in some casualties. There is the question of an earlier Macbeth play, and the undoubted borrowings of Shakespeare from his English predecessors must be remembered.¹⁷ But even in the case of *Hamlet*, are we satisfied that the similarities are due to a deeply-rooted myth awakening the same reactions in minds of great genius? The words of Murray should be carefully weighed: 'Aeschylus, Euripides, and Shakespeare are strikingly similar in certain points which do not occur at all in Saxo or Ambales or the Greek epic.' Each reader must draw his own conclusions.

Shakespeare was a true child of the Renaissance and his plays about Caesar, Troilus, and the rest show that he shared the keen interest about the ancient world which was a feature of his period. He had at least heard of the classical dramatists and must surely have been curious about their works. He had access to the libraries of his university friends, and it may be that with their help he gained a knowledge of one or two of the great tragedies, including the *Choephori*. How far his acquaintance with their contents could have extended it is impossible to say. The question of some Latin version must of course be borne in mind, and the possibility cannot be excluded that such Greek as he himself possessed may have enabled him to follow the originals. The point that Murray makes must also be remembered, that these learned friends themselves may have discussed the plays with him. Further than this we cannot go.

Swinburne in his *Three plays of Shakespeare* several times couples Shakespeare and Aeschylus together. Aeschylus was, he says, in some respects superior to Shakespeare—in height of prophetic power, in depth of reconciling and atoning inspiration; but in other respects Shakespeare was 'the greatest man that ever lived'. In Swinburne's view Aeschylus was 'the one man comparable with Shakespeare'. It would therefore be of especial interest if a link across the centuries could be established between these two mighty minds.

T. FRANCIS GLASSON

¹⁷ See Dr. Janet Spens's *Shakespeare and Tradition* (1916).

CHURCH UNION IN NORTH INDIA

The Present Position

THE INAUGURATION of the Church of South India on 27th September will probably make many wonder whether anything is being done in this direction in the rest of the sub-continent, in both Dominions. The answer to any such inquiry would be that a good deal has been done, and considerable progress made.

In 1929 a Round Table Conference was held, attended by representatives of many Churches, some of which unfortunately have not continued negotiations. The next year's meeting was held in Delhi, at which representatives from South India explained the South India Scheme in its then state. From that year a Joint Council of the United Church of North India (Presbyterian cum

Congregationalist), the Methodist Church in Southern Asia (Methodist Episcopal), and the Baptist Churches, came into existence. It did valuable work, but has not held together, and at the moment its operations seem to be in abeyance.

In 1935 after a long interval the Round Table Conference, which has so far retained that name, was revived. Representatives of the Methodist Church (British and Australasian Conferences), the Church of India, Burma, and Ceylon (Anglican), the Methodist Church in Southern Asia, the United Church of North India, and the Baptist Churches attended this meeting, held in the Free Church at New Delhi. Two years later very considerable progress was made in a meeting at Lucknow, the outstanding features of which were first of all the proposal, accepted unanimously by the Conference, that the Churches desiring to unite should recognize one another's Ministries as true Ministries of Christ's Word and Sacraments. Moreover it was discovered that the Churches there represented were able to agree in general on the Sacraments and on Doctrine. Thus much progress was made.

The next landmark was the adoption in 1941 of proposals for mutual supplemental consecration of the bishops of the two episcopal Churches, Methodist and Anglican, and agreement on the ministry of the laity. It was recommended that the Church after union should be episcopal, its episcopate being both historic and constitutional. No specific interpretation of the historic episcopate is to be demanded, or to be inserted in the Constitution. This follows the South India Scheme, and indeed that Scheme has been in most respects the parent of the Basis of Negotiation prepared in North India. But for the work done in America, the United Kingdom, Australia, and above all South India, far less progress would have been made in North India.

The Proposals as far as settled up to August 1941 have been accepted as a basis of negotiation by the General Council of the Church of India, Burma, and Ceylon, and the North India Provincial Synod of our own Church. Unhappily the Baptists did not take part in the later negotiations. Their very different doctrine of the Church has made it impossible for them to continue for the present. Proposals for local autonomy with regard to infant baptism and believers' baptism had been made, and it was not the doctrine of baptism that caused this secession.

In February 1944 we come to a date that may be of historic importance in the records of the movement toward union. On the 24th of that month the General Council of the Church of India, Burma, and Ceylon passed the following resolution:

WE, the Bishops, Clergy, and Laity of the Anglican Communion in India, Burma, and Ceylon assembled in Council at Nagpur have been burdened with a sense of frustration, as we have considered the failure of twenty-five years of effort to bring union to divided Christians in South India. But in this session there has been given to us a new vision of the unity of Christ's people and new hope as to the means by which that unity can be achieved. It has been laid upon us that we are still depending too much on human contrivance, and that we must learn to trust more fully in God's creative power to do new things and to give to His Church that unity which is according to His will.

We and those with whom we desire to unite are all one as members of the body of

Christ, and through faith in the redemption wrought by God through His only begotten Son, Jesus Christ; but so long as we remain out of communion with one another we are all defective in spiritual power. This is true in a special way of the ordained Ministry. The Ministries of all separated Communion are by the fact of separation imperfect and limited in authority. As a result of this fact, the witness of us all to Christ is seriously compromised, and the work of setting forward God's purpose for the redemption of all mankind is grievously hindered.

We acknowledge that in the past we have failed in manifold ways to forward the work of reconciliation. For these sins of the past we earnestly repent and desire to atone; and we desire to express that penitence not only in words, but also in action. We believe that, when separated Communion come together again, their Ministries should be united by a solemn act of humility and rededication, in which through the mutual laying-on of hands with prayer they seek from God the enrichment of all those Ministries.

If this method of achieving a united Ministry commends itself to the mind and conscience of the Churches, those of us who are ordained ministers, bishops, and presbyters, desire to present ourselves to those duly authorized in these Communion which are seeking to restore the unity of the body of Christ, that we may receive through the laying-on of hands and prayer the spiritual endowment which in separation from them we lack.

We would earnestly commend this suggestion to our own Communion and also to all in other Communion who sincerely desire the union of the faithful, asking them to consider prayerfully whether this step is the will of God for us, and whether we may not hope by this means to be brought very much nearer to that perfect reconciliation and union which we all earnestly desire.

This method of procedure has come to be known as *Supplemental Ordination*. It is fortunate that it emanated from a Church that of all Churches could perhaps least be supposed to be willing to consent to any act that could be called reordination. It will be seen later in this note that the proposed wording to be used at a service of supplemental ordination makes it clear that this is not reordination in the usual sense of the word. No Church could consent to reordination without repudiating the orders of its ministers, and although our Ministries differ in various ways, and we cannot of course all be right, and are probably all in some degree wrong, in our views of orders, yet we are right in maintaining that all our ministers are bodies of truly-ordained men.

This act of the Church of India, Burma, and Ceylon was too late for it to have any effect on the provisions of the South India Scheme, since it would have materially changed that scheme, and so have seriously postponed the date of union. But in North India it has changed the face of the negotiations. It has led to a willingness on the part of other Churches' representatives to move toward those who have made so great a move toward them.

On the successful conclusion of the deliberations in South India the Round Table Conference was again able to meet as a whole, which it did in Allahabad in July 1947. Resolutions were passed, after very careful discussion, in favour of supplemental ordination, and although at the outset it seemed likely that there would be a divided vote, yet when the proposals were put into their final form, they were unanimously accepted. This naturally meant no more than that the representatives would recommend them to their Churches, but for the most part they were men of much weight and influence, and it may be hoped

that the result will be general acceptance. If so, then it is possible that in less than seven years, union of these four Churches, Methodists of two organizations, the United Church, and the Church of India, Burma, and Ceylon, may come about.

The relevant resolutions are given below, but first of all it is necessary that two paragraphs accepted in 1941 should be set forth, since they form an important part of the foundation on which the later resolutions are based. (Remember that these have been accepted in principle by our own North India Provincial Synod and the General Council of the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon.)

The Church is a royal priesthood of believers (1 Peter 2^{5, 9}), and all its members have direct access to God. This signifies that 'all the members have their share in the commission and authority of the whole Church. Confirmed by the Holy Spirit, they all have the rights and duties of a priesthood of believers, offering to God in and with His Son the sacrifice of themselves and all their powers. To the whole Church and to every member of it belong the duty and the privilege of spreading the Good News of the Kingdom of God, and the Message of Salvation through Jesus Christ' (*Constitution, Church of India, Burma, and Ceylon*, Declaration 3, p. 14).

The Churches desiring to unite mutually acknowledge each others' Ministries as Ministries of Christ in His Word and Sacraments, although in our present state of division they cannot be regarded as fully representative of the Church as a whole.

On the basis of these paragraphs the recent meeting of the Round Table Conference passed the following resolutions on supplemental ordination, which are to be presented to the Churches represented at the Conference. Of these two are fully autonomous, the United Church of North India and the Church of India, Burma, and Ceylon. The two Methodist Churches are not autonomous, though the Methodist Church in Southern Asia is more nearly so than our own branch of the Methodist Church. It is, however, important for the other two Churches, which are not yet fully self-supporting, and which quite rightly do not wish to jeopardize their status with other Churches of their respective Communion with which they are at present in full communion, that they too should be able to secure the general approval of the Churches in the West from which they sprang. It would be an act of doubtful wisdom to promote a union in India that would cause division between India and the Church of the West.

This Conference accepts the principle of the Unification of the Ministry by the mutual laying-on of hands in an act of supplemental ordination to the Ministry of the united Church.

This involves the acknowledgement of a common lack in all our Ministries due to our division, in that they are limited in authority and have not the seal of the whole Church.

We propose that at the inauguration of Union, the existing presbyters and bishops of each of the uniting Churches should accept through the laying-on of hands of the duly-authorized persons of the other Churches uniting with them the additional authority and grace that they lack in separation. This should take place at a solemn service, an essential part of which should be prayer for the additional gifts that God alone can bestow.

We are of opinion that it would be necessary after the consecration of the bishops of the united Church for services to be arranged in each area for supplemental ordination, in which the authorities of all the uniting Churches would take part.

We suggest that at the laying-on of hands the following words, or words closely similar, should be used:

'RECEIVE the Holy Ghost for the fuller exercise of Christ's Ministry and priesthood in the Church of God; and for a wider and more effectual service therein take thou authority to preach the Word of God, to fulfil the ministry of reconciliation, and to minister Christ's Sacraments in the congregations whereunto thou shalt be further called or regularly appointed. And see that thou do all these things in brotherly partnership with God's fellow-workers whom in this union of Churches He has made thine.'

WILLIAM MACHIN

Recent Literature

The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition, by C. K. Barrett. (S.P.C.K., 15s.)

Whence did the early Church derive its beliefs about the Spirit and its certainty that it itself was inspired? Was it from the teaching of Jesus, or from some source in Hellenistic religion or Oriental mysticism? This clearly raises a most important question about the Unity of the New Testament, and it has not been very fully investigated in England. Mr. Barrett examines the Conception of Jesus by the Holy Spirit, the Descent of the Spirit at His Baptism, and His conflicts with evil spirits in His Temptations and exorcisms, adding accounts of Jesus as miracle-worker and as prophet. The results all point the same way—Jesus was in fact a 'pneumatic' Person, but He said little about it, for He had the Spirit by virtue of His Messiahship, which He kept secret. We might accept the argument so far without accepting the answer, more briefly argued, to the further question why Jesus did not foretell the coming of the Spirit upon the Church. Mr. Barrett thinks that a germinal 'kingdom' corresponded to His veiled Messiahship, but on the whole his eschatology is more reminiscent of Dr. Schweitzer than of Professor Dodd. He believes that Jesus did not foresee what Dr. Flew has called 'The Community of the Interval', for He did not distinguish between the Resurrection and the Parousia, and accordingly there was no room for an intermediate event at Pentecost. The book concludes with a brief assurance that the unforeseen Church which filled the unexpected interval was in fact inspired by the Spirit, rightly interpreted as a Messianic blessing and an earnest of ultimate beatitude. Mr. Barrett, who is a Methodist Minister teaching in the University of Durham, has in this his first book established a claim to a high place among students of the New Testament. He deals, however, rather confidently with some eminent scholars. While such a work does not aim at being popular, the style and arrangement of this book seem needlessly austere. Where Mr. Barrett's conclusions are surprising, they deserve serious discussion, for he presents them with a wealth of learning and exact scholarship.

A. RAYMOND GEORGE

Let God be God. An Interpretation of the Theology of Martin Luther, by Philip S. Watson. (Epworth Press, 10s. 6d.)

'Tell me,' a German theologian staying at a Cambridge College is reported to have asked of his host, 'do the English students read their Luther always in the German original or only in English translations?' The question, alas! is as relevant as it is pathetic. In the wilderness of common British ignorance, contempt, and distortion of Luther there are few oases; this book is one of them. 'The People called Methodists' may well be expected to show sympathy and understanding for the genius of Martin Luther, and it is not inappropriate that a Fernley-Hartley lecture should be devoted to an interpretation of his theology. Mr. Watson has not only read, but sometimes improved, the translations; moreover, he has translated a great many passages for the first time; he is thoroughly at home in modern Continental (including Scandinavian) Luther research; but above all he knows the original and has made it very definitely 'his Luther'. In five chapters he pictures 'Luther as a Theologian', 'The Motif of Luther's Thought', 'The Revelation of God', 'The Theology of the Cross', and 'The Doctrine of the Word'. Ample footnotes, conveniently put at the end of each chapter, lead to the sources. Karl Holl (of whose monumental Luther studies this is, I believe, the first English appreciation and

digest in thirty years) would probably complain that not all quotations have been given from the Weimar Edition. Again, the general reader might desire some guidance about an introductory selection from Luther's writings, and the specialist will miss a reference to the issues raised by Elert, particularly in the treatment of Natural Theology and of the Atonement, while the Methodist might ask for an exposition of the sentence 'anyone who is familiar with Charles Wesley's hymns has already a fair acquaintance with Luther's theology, albeit in its Anglican translation'. Mr. Watson could easily answer all these criticisms. Choosing his texts from so vast a store, he could not possibly say everything and please everybody. What he has done is far more important: he has called on Luther to speak for himself, keeping Melancthon safely out of the way, and removing even such time-honoured misinterpretations as those of which Wesley was guilty. Henceforth, let us hope, it will be impossible for our divines, Anglican or Nonconformist, to quote Harnack and Troeltsch as substitutes for Luther or to dismiss his theology altogether with a few cheap slogans borrowed from Romanist pamphlets. Neither will they be able to claim that Mr. Watson's plea is 'Continental'. Barth does not figure in the Index of Proper Names, and Brunner only once in a critical parenthesis. Mr. Watson states his case, even against his opponents, with a calm politeness of which his German master was quite incapable. In the attempt to guard Luther's explosive expressions from dangerous abuses and to show the consistency of his theological thought, he is perhaps anticipating a peculiar English prejudice and going at times to greater lengths than Luther himself would have done (in the balancing, for instance, under the twofold knowledge of God, of justice and mercy in the atonement, and of 'fundamentalism' and criticism in the doctrine of the Word). One could wish that pages which inevitably had to be taken up with the rescue of Luther from some of his modern interpreters (particularly in Chapter 4), could have been devoted to the enlargement of the book's great theme, 'Let God be God', to include Luther's doctrine of the Eucharist, where it finds its climax. But it would be foolish to grumble over details where the debt of gratitude is so great. This book forces its readers to turn to Luther himself, and that is the measure of its success.

FRANZ HILDEBRANDT

The Theology of John Wesley, by William R. Cannon. (Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, \$2.50.)

It is remarkable that this simple title has not been given to any important book before. Perhaps even Methodists think of Wesley rather as a religious genius than as a theologian, so that we have many a 'Life' but seldom a 'Theology'. Dr. Cannon, a young American Methodist Minister who teaches Church History at Emory University, has boldly attempted to fill the gap. After the title come the words: 'With special reference to the Doctrine of Justification.' Accordingly, the first part gives a very readable account of the historical background (Anglicanism, Wesley's home, Moravianism, Aldersgate Street, the conflict with Calvinism) and then expounds justification as Wesley's central doctrine. The second part deals with the concepts that arise from it, God and Providence, Man and Sin, Redemption and Assurance, the Moral Life and Christian Perfection; it omits the Church and the Means of Grace. Dr. Cannon's bold enterprise has been admirably carried out. Out of a detailed knowledge of the Works, he lets Wesley speak for himself, though his Sunday Service for Methodist use does not seem to have been directly consulted. He does not hesitate to discuss difficulties (though we could do with a fuller discussion of the *Minutes* of 1770), and he quotes 'awkward' passages, though we miss the famous retraction, 'I marvel they did not stone us!' The quotation from the Journal for 15th June 1741 must now be read in the light of Mr. Philip Watson's

recent criticism of it. The use of the phrase 'absolute, not relative, Christian perfection' (p. 239) is a serious exaggeration, for Wesley's doctrine of perfection does not claim the title 'absolute'. (See Lindström, pp. 145 ff., a work too late to be included in the admirable bibliography.) Apart from these details, the book is balanced, scholarly, and accurate; moreover, the author has a warm Methodist sympathy for the doctrines which he describes. His book will take its place with Piette, Lindström, and other distinguished contributions from overseas. It should call widespread attention to Methodism's character as a 'unique synthesis' (in Dr. Cell's famous phrase) or as a *via media* (which the publishers claim). Certainly every Methodist Minister should read it.

A. RAYMOND GEORGE

The Poem of Job: A Literary Study with a New Translation, by William Barron Stevenson. (Oxford Press, 7s. 6d.)

This work by the Emeritus Professor of Semitic Languages in the University of Glasgow is the ripe fruit of long-continued study, and only a first-class linguist could have written it. At the same time it is not intended for Hebraists only. Any reader will profit by it who loves great literature, for the book of Job falls in that class. Dr. Stevenson's primary concern, as his title indicates, is with the Poem of Job, as distinct from the prose framework in which it is set. In common with most scholars today, he regards the Elihu speeches, the poem on Wisdom in Chapter 28, and the Behemoth and Leviathan sections, as later additions. Of the original poem he gives a superb translation, whose hammer-beats reproduce the force of the Hebrew trimeter, and which even preserves something of the assonance and alliteration used in Hebrew poetry. The translation is followed by eight chapters on the contents and character of the Poem. As against the prevailing opinion that this was intended to take the place of a prose dialogue in an already existing work which the poet had before him, Dr. Stevenson thinks it was an entirely independent composition, the work of a writer who owed nothing to tradition, and who may even have created the tradition which later found expression in a varied folk-lore. Some will join issue with him on this question, but at least Dr. Stevenson shows that the differences of standpoint between the poetical and prose sections of the book are more numerous and marked than has generally been noted. Not the least challenging of his conclusions is that we ought to revise our opinion of Job's 'comforters', which has been too uncritically based upon what Yahweh says of them in the prose, and therefore—in Dr. Stevenson's view—independent passage, 42²⁷.

C. R. NORTH

The Legends of Israel, Vol. I, translated from the Hebrew of J. B. Levner by Joel Snowman. (James Clarke, 10s. 6d.)

J. B. Levner was a Russian Jew who sought to foster among Jewish children a love for the legends of their ancestors. In 1898 he published in five volumes a collection of Haggadic material, selected from the great mass of Rabbinic literature, arranged according to Biblical chronology, and written in simple Hebrew. This work, which ran into several editions, is now being rendered into English by Mr. Joel Snowman. In a Foreword, Dr. Cecil Roth maintains that the stories inculcate 'Jewish ideals of humanity, of piety, of charity, of justice, of mercy, of righteousness', and contain 'none of the brutality, immorality or amorality, crass superstition and exaltation of violence, that characterize so much of the folk-lore of other peoples'. A sympathetic reader will not seriously dispute the claim. The gracious and whimsical spirit of the best traditions of Jewish piety is here faithfully represented. The stories included in this first volume range from the Creation to the Oppression in

Egypt. If the edifying embroidery contrasts with the telling simplicity of the Biblical narratives, at least the embroidery is usually edifying. We read that, while God gave Adam the 'Stone of Thick Darkness' and the 'Stone of the Shadow of Death' after his expulsion from the Garden of Eden, yet, when he struck one stone against another, fire came from them and dispelled the darkness. Again, the high standards of Jewish hospitality and domestic virtue are reflected in the stories of Abraham and Sarah, and of Rebecca. In a somewhat different vein there is the story of the one-day-old unicorn, forty-four and a half parasangs long, which sought admittance to the Ark. Noah, boring a hole in the wall, fastened its snout in it, and when the waters rose the unicorn floated and was able to breathe through the hole. Though intended for Jewish children, this book is an excellent introduction to a type of Jewish literature with which most Christians are unfamiliar. References are given in the text and in a Hebrew index to the Rabbinic sources used by Levner.

G. W. ANDERSON

Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism, by Gershom G. Scholem. (Shocken Books, New York, \$5.50.)

All who are interested in the place of the mystical element in religion will have cause to be deeply grateful to Professor Scholem of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem for this study. Even for many of his own people the writings of the Jewish mystics have long been a closed book, while, apart from a very few, non-Jews have scarcely been aware of their existence, let alone of their importance. Again, only a very specialized linguistic equipment will enable anyone to penetrate far into this field for himself. Prof. Scholem does not set out to give a complete historical account of the origins and developments of Jewish mysticism, nor does he write for the specialist only. His purpose is to outline some of its principal features and to analyse some of its most important phases. Beginning with a chapter on the general characteristics of Jewish mysticism, the book goes on to deal with the first and longest period in its development, extending from the first to the tenth century A.D. Next, the writer traces the rise in Medieval times of certain groups of Jewish mystical writers, 'the devout of Germany', who owed their inspiration less to the general theological and philosophical discussions of the period than to the persecutions to which the Jews were subjected by the Crusaders. Finally, he deals in turn with the Zohar, Isaac Luria and his School, Sabbatai Zevi, and the Hasidic movement of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries of which Professor Martin Buber has been so outstanding an exponent. Detailed comment is impossible here, but this is a work of major importance. Since it is published in America, it will not be easily available to the British reader, but I trust that copies will find their way into our theological libraries and will not be allowed to lie idle on the shelves.

W. W. SIMPSON

The Medieval Manichee, a Study of the Christian Dualist Heresy. By Steven Runciman. (Cambridge Press, 15s.)

This very learned work by a Fellow of Trinity, Cambridge, is dedicated to 'My Father', Lord Runciman, a name well known in Methodism. The son has written it at Athens where he holds a post in the diplomatic service and where he must come in contact with many of the strange heresies to whose elucidation and fortunes the work is devoted. In England we have never had much to do with them, for as the Inquisition was never recognized by us, every bishop had to deal with his heresies at his own expense, and, if the heretic fled to another diocese, the work must begin over again. As a rule the bishop was unwilling to follow him up—and there were but two archbishops. Hence until recently a curious ignorance among English theologians

of these byways of unfaith. I remember well myself the old ideas I held, imbibed from Foxe, that the Albigenians (whose adepts, in fact, sought death by powdered glass) were primitive Protestants, and the mild shock I had at finding that Simon de Montfort, whom English people almost deemed a saint, had something, it was not very clear what, to do with killing them off at Albi, Toulouse, Beziers, etc. From this error I was delivered when I met with Lea's vast work on the *Medieval Inquisition*. Through him I became acquainted with Cathari, Paterenes, Paulicians, Bogomils, and many other obscure heretics. And now Mr. Runciman has written this very learned work on all these right down to their final florescence in the later Middle Ages. There are few scholars qualified to act as Mr. Runciman's critics, and I am certainly not one, but Mr. Runciman has convinced me of one thing—the great debt the Church owes to the great medieval saints and thinkers who steered the Church of Christ through the swamps and shallows of dualism and its oft attempted perversions in different forms of the faith of our fathers.

H. B. WORKMAN

A Sixteenth-century Indian Mystic: Dadu and His Followers, by W. G. Orr. (Lutterworth Press, 18s.)

Dadu, a contemporary of Shakespeare, was a North Indian Mystic. His work has been little known in the West except to students of Hindi. Dr. Orr has written a full, critical study of the man, his writings and his cult. Historians of the human struggle to attain the vision of God will have to find a place for the eager quest of this religious soul. His aspirations in the Bānī, his book of psalms, come down to us like disconnected beads, but Dr. Orr's translations and arrangements bring out the significance and beauty of some devotional jewels which suggest comparison with classical treasures from the mines of other countries. Students of Indian religion will recognize how much Dadu owed to various schools of Hindu thought. He was careless of orthodoxy. He sang and dreamed of the Divine life under many names, regardless of consistency. He belongs to the *bhakti* tradition of fitful reaction from pantheism by men forced through an acute sense of sin and frustration to yearn after a God of grace. Scores of his songs are a tragic cry of utter need. Dadu wants more than to be absorbed into the Infinite. He seeks a God whose love will save him:

O take not away my life till I have beheld Thee.

If I be separated from Thee now, how shall I meet Thee again?

Dadu's teaching is of particular interest today, for he lived through a period of bitter persecution, while Muslim invaders were forcing their faith on conquered Hindus. The agelong conflict of monotheistic Islam with polytheistic and atheistic Hinduism is behind so much of today's news from India that it is impressive to watch Dadu frankly borrowing from both faiths any help that would lead him closer to the vision of God and communion with Him.

G. STAINTON MARRIS

The Rediscovery of Justice, by F. R. Bienenfeld. (Allen and Unwin, 15s.)

This volume, in itself both weighty and important, is another indication how deeply thoughtful men are concerned with the question of justice in the modern world. 'Few words are more current than "justice" and "injustice"', wrote Emil Brunner in his recent *Justice and the Social Order*, 'but who knows what justice is? Who can say what is just and unjust? Nobody can say what justice is, we are told,

because justice is a relative thing.' Dr. Bienenfeld's book should be read alongside that of Brunner, to which he refers in his preface, and to which in some sense his own book is complementary. As Dr. Bienenfeld sees it, there are two diametrically opposed conceptions of justice at work amongst men, giving diverse shape to laws and institutions. One sets Justice as the highest aim of the state, superior to Law, a driving force toward a stable order of peace. The other believes Justice to be subordinate to Law, a sentimental conception without relation to any objective reality. Under the former, there is the assertion of a Natural Law of Justice, which in Christian terms is the Law of God, and to which all human law ought to conform. With the latter goes the denial of any supernatural Law of Justice and the assertion that Law derives its sanction from the power to enforce it and the might of the stronger. Is the right of a man to live, to be free and not a slave, to have freedom from illegal arrest, to leave his own country, to choose his own religion, and so on, derived merely from existing State laws or from a justice inherent in the nature of things? Dr. Bienenfeld's discussion of the problem is interesting for three reasons: (i) the analogy that he draws between the family and the State. The problem of according human rights to individuals is seen in miniature in the family, between fathers and sons, brothers and brothers. There is a tendency, one feels, to overwork the analogy, but it carries Dr. Bienenfeld a long way, as, for example, when he works from the decline of *patria potestas* within the family to the emergence of the 'fatherless society' when the centralized authority of Roman Empire and Papacy broke down. (ii) The view that Justice in public order must deal with five eternal social demands simultaneously, namely: security of life and property (Conservatism), freedom (Liberalism), social co-operation in attaining the means of livelihood (Socialism), equality (Communism), personal status (responsibility of Private and Public Law). These social demands lie at the basis of any doctrine of human rights, and must be kept in view together. To press one, unmindful of the others, constitutes injustice and spells social instability. In a very telling paragraph Dr. Bienenfeld attributes the instability of French politics since the Revolution to this cause. (iii) The contention that abstract justice, or as he describes it, 'a condition of objective and impartial justice', is unattainable in mortal affairs, and even if it were, would inevitably cause general discontent. 'Justice', he says, 'by its very nature, must refrain from completely fulfilling any one of the eternal social demands, in order to protect all others, and must, therefore, deny full realization to the most ardent desires of human beings'. In this tumbling contention, Dr. Bienenfeld, international jurist, comes near to Emil Brunner, Christian theologian. What then? Here again there is a striking and significant agreement between the two. Both claim that the problem of justice runs up into that of love. Here the theologian: 'Justice is nothing but that form of love which has currency in the world of institutions, that materialization of love which is necessary as men live in institutions. That is why love is always just too, but justice is not always love. Whoever can open up the fountain of love has rendered the greatest service to justice.' Now the international jurist, who ends with quoting Isaiah 11¹⁻⁹: 'Justice derives its driving forces both from love and a sense of solidarity, and from fear and an egoistic desire for security. Love and solidarity operate to reduce the application of force to a minimum by inducing the individual voluntarily to renounce aggression and to agree to the fulfilment of the claims of others. Fear and the impulse of survival are authority's last resources should sympathy prove unavailing.' So the ultimate problem remains, and will remain to the end of time: What can constrain mortal and sinful men perfectly to love mercy and to do justly to one another? The answer is that only the exceeding grace of God can do it, and so man's eternal need of religion is once more demonstrated.

E. C. URWIN

The Meaning of Existence, by Charles Duell Kean. (Latimer House, 12s. 6d.)

While reconstruction after the upheaval of global war is inevitably a universal concern, there is by no means universal appreciation of the problem it involves. Dr. Kean believes that mankind may have come to a time of what Professor Toynbee has called 'epochal crisis'—one of those rare times when crucial decisions are made that decide the fate of civilizations. Such decisions are made at a much deeper level than the mass of men generally understand, and they are made by leaders whom the mass of men will follow. They are not concerned primarily with repairs to the damaged fabric of civilized institutions, nor yet with the rehabilitation of shattered cultural values, but have to do with the meaning of existence itself. In elaborating this thesis, the author distinguishes between three levels of experience, and argues that while these are admittedly inseparable and inter-locked, the third of them is of primary importance. The first is the level of history, or of political and economic institutions and events. Its characteristics are time and change. These are no respecters of persons, and man's experience at this level must be described in terms of 'fate' and 'necessity'. The second level is that of the intellect—the philosophical and ethical level. Its characteristics are changelessness and 'being'. Here man is master in his own house—but is not content with this. He seeks to extend his mastery by imposing his intellectual values upon history—and as constantly fails. His failure leads to the problem of the third level of experience. This is the level of 'existence', or of immediate self-awareness and awareness of other persons. Its problem is described in terms of 'tragedy', 'anxiety', and 'guilt'. The solution of this problem, only to be found on the level where it is experienced, is furnished only by religion. Although religion finds expression in historical and intellectual forms, it is primarily existential in character. Its function is to solve the problem of tragedy and anxiety by revealing to man the meaning of his own existence. It appears characteristically in the form of 'myth'; and a 'myth' is 'a description of man's existence in terms of a story related to history but oriented toward eternity'. Christianity is no exception to this rule. Essentially it is neither an historical institution nor an intellectual (theological or ethical) doctrine, but a Gospel in the form of a story, of which the central theme is the Cross and Resurrection of Christ. This Gospel alone furnishes an adequate basis for the reconstruction of our world, for it alone effectively delivers men, when they accept it, from their slavery to tragedy and anxiety, and it alone gives significance to their entire experience at all three levels. This book contains much that is profound and stimulating, but much of it might surely have been said more simply and directly. The author, who acknowledges a special debt to Kierkegaard, is at pains to define his terms and obviate misunderstanding, yet, when he speaks of Christian 'mythology' and analyses it in an abstract and intellectualistic way, he does not do justice either to the reality of Divine action in history, or to the doctrine that 'the Word was made flesh', or even to the believer's 'existential' encounter with Christ. It is a pity that the book ends without telling us how to tell the 'story' to the modern world. It diagnoses and prescribes very well; but how is the medicine to be administered?

PHILIP S. WATSON

Man As Sinner: In Contemporary American Realist Theology, by Mary Frances Thelen. (Oxford Press, 16s.)

This is an important book; first, because it analyses the writings of a little group of men who have had a large influence in America and in this country; and secondly, because it calls attention to a theological and religious question which has been steadily growing in urgency in this age of two world wars. The question is here defined as the conflict between liberalism and realism. By the first the author means

the view of religion which emphasizes obedience to the commands of the Sermon on the Mount, and believes that, as these are more widely observed, society will progress toward the ideals of the Kingdom of God; and by the second the view which rests on the fact of sin as a corrupting influence in the whole human race, and calls therefore, not for a moral endeavour after justice and goodwill, but for a radical change of heart brought about through repentance and humility. Not that the 'liberals' (to use the rather overworked term) neglect the fact of sin. F. R. Tennant, whom the author takes as one of their leaders, has written two impressive works on the subject. To him no act is sinful for which the agent cannot be held responsible, and God alone can judge of its culpability. But, to quote from Miss Thelen, 'today realistic theology affirms that the universality of sin means its inevitability in every act; and theology, rather than ending, has taken on fresh vitality through this reversal of judgement'. This 'swing of theological thought toward pessimism concerning man' was partly the result of social behaviour since 1918; but it was deeply affected first by the theories (discoveries, as their supporters would call them) of the Freudians, and more especially by what Miss Thelen calls 'the neurosis', the original 'Oedipus complex', and its abiding results in fear and anxiety; and second by the teachings of Marx, which, determinist as they are, call, as Miss Thelen suggests, for the replacement of the social order by a better one and condemn all the *bourgeoisie* as sinners. The 'realistic' theologians whose work she examines are the two Niebuhrs, W. M. Horton, R. L. Calhoun, and John Bennett. The developments in the thought of each, especially of the first named, and the similarities and differences between them, are carefully brought out. They can hardly be said to form a school; each has been influenced by the rest, but each has been feeling his own way. One cannot but be grateful for their attempts to look the world's evil in the face, and for their resolve to regard sin as something more than a theological abstraction. Yet a student of theology might be forgiven for thinking that their accounts of original sin would have been less hazy if they had paid more attention to the standard works of J. B. Mozley and N. P. Williams (neither of them mentioned in the body of the book nor in its very extensive bibliography), or even to the evangelical doctrines of redemption and salvation. Miss Thelen has given us a fairly exhaustive exposition of the five writers. Her pages are full of quotations and detailed references. Here and there she hints at her own experience, and reveals a wider study of philosophy; and she brings her essay to an end with a few pages of modest and restrained 'reflections'.

W. F. LOFTHOUSE

The Sin of Our Age, by D. R. Davies. (Bles, The Centenary Press, 6s.)

A German reader of this book is astonished to discover how strong is the similarity between all those who belong to the Civilization of the West. 'The Meaning of Western Civilization' (Chapter 1) points out that this civilization is distinguished from preceding civilization by its universality, its progressive substitution of human energy by solar energy, and the domination of culture by science. In spite of all its achievements 'Western civilization is the Satan among civilizations. It alone has committed the Titanic sin'. Therefore 'repentance, not just intelligence, is Europe's vital need today'. Yet one does not get a true definition of the term nor does one find the call for repentance based on the only solid ground: 'The kingdom of God is at hand.' This seems to be the weak point in the whole argument of the book. While the sin and sins of our age are painted in gloomy colours, one looks in vain for a similarly vivid and helpful reinterpretation of the Christian message. 'The Root Sin of Western Civilization' (Chapter 2) is seen both inside and outside the Church in that 'humanity is assumed to be absolute'. Although the critical survey of the development of the time since the Renaissance is very searching, one feels sometimes

a little uncomfortable because the standards by which everything is measured seem to be rather medieval than Biblical. It is significant that the fact of the Reformation and its vital and promising implications do not figure at all in the argument. Under the heading, 'Can Western Civilization Survive?' (Chapter 3), three main problems are discussed, viz., how to organize and maintain world peace, the problem of social security, and the problem of population. These 'problems of survival' cannot be solved because of 'The abolition of other-worldliness' (Chapter 4), 'The dissolution of Spirit' (Chapter 5) and 'The degradation of the human person' (Chapter 6). While it is good news to read that 'theology is the linchpin of civilization' it should be more clearly based on the Bible and the Reformation. Then the Gospel as a message of hope would be more apparent and less stress would be laid upon the negative value of theology as a defence against current ideologies. Marxism, Leninism, and Stalinism are treated too indiscriminately, for it is a very sweeping statement to identify 'Marxism and Nazism', or to speak of 'Communism, or red Fascism'. Both Marxism and Russia should first of all be seen as a great challenge to the Western civilization. No good word is said about Marxism, yet it was to a great extent a reaction against the exploitation of man. We also have good reason to believe in the still existing Christian forces in Russia, and we should be slow in judging the Russian Church, which surely cannot have suffered everything in vain. Again, 'The Recovery of Christian Belief' (Chapter 7) does not depend upon psychological and sociological considerations, or on the process of historical development, in which the author believes as 'powerful allies', but on the only One with authority to forgive all sins in all ages, who can very well do without Western civilization if He so wishes. Yet, when all is said, this is a brave and sometimes prophetic book, which does not hesitate to call things by their real names.

RUDOLF WECKERLING

One Increasing Purpose, by Maldwyn Edwards. (Epworth Press, 5s.)

The Christian Future, by Eugen Rosenstock-Huussy. (S.C.M., 8s. 6d.)

In his Beckly Lecture, *One Increasing Purpose*, Dr. Maldwyn Edwards speaks to the current hour. He writes for those who are asking: 'Is there any discernible meaning in human life?' As a confident, and even exuberant, Christian, he is convinced that there is a Christian answer and no alternative to it. (He is also a Methodist—using Methodist thought-forms, phrased in echoes of the New Testament and of Wesley's hymns.) So he evokes his reader's friendly sympathy—and a kindly tolerance of the book's superficial flaws. Some of his easy generalizations may be called (in charity) 'homiletically carefree'. 'In Hitlerite Germany the Church alone made an *effective* protest. . . .' Did it? Some quotations are less than accurate. 'Dean Inge has spoken somewhere of the pimply red excrescences. . . .' Surely 'bungaloid' was the Dean's word? There is an occasional casualness of reference. Was it really 'George R. Sims' who 'in one of his novels depicted a world which owing to the deep-laid plot of two men fell victim to the delusion that the Resurrection had not taken place'? Is there here perchance a faint recollection of Guy Thorne's *When It was Dark*? Yet Dr. Edwards will not be disconcerted by the discovery of small defects in his workmanship. He thrusts gallantly forward to his goal—and reaches it. A judicious mixture of metaphor is needed to depict the book. It is rich with the spoils of wide reading, flung with a lavish hand. (One can have Tennyson, Kierkegaard, Dostoevski, Nietzsche, Hardy, Henley, Bertrand Russell, Julian Huxley, J. D. Bernal, C. H. Waddington, Lancelot Hogben, and Laplace—at one page opening!) No mere *olla podrida* though. 'Fine, confused, feeding' was what Dr. John Brown's Caledonian said of his singed sheep's head—and no mistake about the food-value! In an analysis Dr. Edwards charts the course of his argument under three tasks which must be

accomplished before the Reign of God in men's hearts is fulfilled—first, the task of the demolition of 'all those social habits which have evil consequences . . .'; second, the creating of the 'right conditions of life whereby men can more easily recognize the King in His beauty . . .'; third, the bringing about of 'the response of the soul to God' by 'the proclamation of the Word'. This is a worthy book on a great theme.

In a Foreword to the second book, Dr. Oldham calls its writer 'one of the remarkable figures of our time', and in the last paragraph he writes: 'His mind is too quick and fertile for most of us . . . he skips a few steps in his argument and expects the intelligent reader to skip with him and . . . when he skips he is apt . . . to turn in air and come down, not at all on the previous line of approach where the intelligent reader expected to find him, but on a line altogether different.' The reviewer found this to be strictly true, and being uncertain whether he was sufficiently 'intelligent' for the book, tested it on several other minds. Their comments are appended: 'Reminded me of Douglas Jerrold's attempt to read *Sordello*'; 'It is a "missing idea" competition rather than a book'; 'Christianity it may be—but not Christianity without tears'; 'Perverse paradox—a web woven out of the entrails of the spider'; 'Evidently written as an exposition of the sub-title—*The Modern Mind Outrun*'. Older readers of *Punch* may recall a book-review of record brevity: 'Maurice Hewlett: *The Queen's Quair*. So's the book.' That may stand! There are flashes of light and truth—if only the author could think in English! Perhaps if Mrs. Taylor's housemaid could have got hold of the MS., as she did of *The French Revolution*, a reviewer would gladly have helped her, if only he could have been sure that, like Carlyle, this writer would heed the voice of the celestial Schoolmaster: 'Write it again, boy, and write it better!' And yet, and yet—there is transcendent merit disguised and hidden under obscurity of thought and style.

R. D. MOORE

Behind the Iron Curtain, by George Moorad. (Latimer House, 12s. 6d.)

The author of this book is an intrepid American editor who seems to have a genius for being on the spot when crucial events are happening. In this record of personal experiences he gives a vivid picture of Russian policy and procedure both in Russia herself and in her satellite states from Jugo-Slavia to Manchuria, and the reader cannot fail to be amazed and horrified by his account of secret police, duplicity and ruthless censorship, sudden arrest and deportation. To men accustomed to Western law and liberty, the Russian world is a nightmare. It is no exaggeration to say that Muscovite censorship and intimidation make the Roman Catholic Inquisition and Index appear fumbling and amateurish. What we regard as the irreducible rights of individuality have ceased to exist. Mr. Moorad's verdict on Soviet policy *outside* the realm of Russian control is equally disconcerting. The intransigence that, refusing to budge, compelled the sick and dying Roosevelt to fly to Yalta, was only a foretaste of the undisguised suspicion and hostility which, as Mr. Byrnes's revelations show, were normal even before the President's death. Russia has apparently decided that it is impossible for Communist and Capitalist systems to live in amity. Our problem, therefore, is to avoid both subjugation to Russia and war with her. The policy of appeasement that failed with Hitler and Mussolini is not likely to succeed with Stalin, Molotov, and Vishinsky. Mr. Moorad would agree with the doctrine of Sir Norman Angell's latest book, that it is not strength but weakness that provokes war. His conclusion is that we should, in self-defence, build up with our allies such an aggregate of power as will enable us to maintain our rights and ensure immunity from attack. It is certain that such strength would be no threat to world-peace, but its best, indeed its sole, guarantee.

F. BROMPTON HARVEY

The Anglican Tradition in the Life of England, by A. T. P. Williams. (S.C.M. 6s.)

The Church of England in the Twentieth Century (Vol. 1), by Roger Lloyd. (Longmans, 15s.)

Methodism, Her Unfinished Task, by W. E. Sangster. (Epworth Press, 2s. 6d.)

The Baptist Movement in the Reformation and Onwards, by Ernest A. Payne. (Kingsgate Press, 1s.)

These books, very different as they are, all express deep and sincere interest in the traditions which have enriched the lives of their writers, who are all convinced of the blessings God has brought in their several branches of the Church, yet they all write, not only with charity toward members of other denominations, but with a sense of loss that the robe of Christ's Body is not yet seamless. These books, therefore, will serve readers both inside and outside the Anglican, Methodist, and Baptist communions. The Bishop of Durham's little book, a counterpart to Ernest A. Payne's excellent *Free Church Tradition*, is not small in scope or treatment. Its approach is not quite the same as Mr. Payne's. It is not a handbook of Church History, but, as Dr. Williams calls it, 'an historical essay' with 'commentary rather than narrative'. It conveys frankly and with fine judgement the virtues and defects of the generations of Anglicans from the days of Cranmer to those of William Temple. While he is without distinctive party bias, Dr. Williams begins with the Elizabethan Church, for 'there is nothing that goes near to justifying any general inclusion of pre-Reformation history in an account of the Anglican tradition'. He writes of life in the parishes as well as of doctrines and policies.

Of Canon Roger Lloyd's book one may use the word 'patchy' without any intention of offence, for it has the patchiness of an enthusiast and a lover of colour. He has a difficult task, for he needs to assess the value of books, movements, men, and events, all of which have not yet run their complete course. Here objectivity is hard to achieve and personal preference must reveal itself. The author regards his work as 'a Meditation upon an Historical Theme'. For him the hero of the Anglican Church is the vicar or curate. 'The level of the whole Church can never rise higher than the level of its parish clergy.' But other subjects are not neglected. There are, for instance, surveys of Victorian and Edwardian England under the crises caused by the rise of Biblical Criticism, Anglo-Catholicism, and Social Service. There are also many short but excellent accounts of men as diverse as Gore, Hensley Henson, and Illingworth. Some typographical slips need to be corrected. Von Hügel's essays on suffering are in his *Essays and Addresses* (not *Reviews*), and Whittier's 'Dear Lord and Father of Mankind' was hardly one of the hymns that Dearmer first made widely known, for the Methodists had it in their hymn-book of 1904. Again, is it not somewhat extravagant to claim for men trained by Frere and Gore that, though they 'may have been odd in some ways', 'by their lives Jesus was being preached as He had not been preached in England for centuries'?

This brings us to Dr. Sangster's latest task—that of challenging his own people to complete the work of their forefathers. While he holds to the ancient ways, it is with a very acute sense of their value for today. His arresting and popularly written book will provoke much argument, with, let us hope, an outcome in fresh effort. Not the least valuable part of it is a series of questions for discussion. Dr. Sangster sees in Methodism resources which can be used, under God, for the revival of that quest for Scriptural holiness which was characteristic of its earliest exponents, for an acceptance of a world-wide mission, and for a precise application of Christianity to the stewardship of money, talents, and daily work. In particular, he claims that the Methodist Church has a special function both in the re-Christianizing of the rural areas and in the claiming of laymen's service in the Name of Christ.

Mr. Payne's lecture is of the quality that one expects from him. He passes in swift

but competent review the many and different elements which from the days of Luther onward strove to establish the validity of believers' baptism, and then surveys the modern developments of the Baptist Movement. Here he cannot resist the temptation to gird gently at the Bishop of Oxford for suggesting that 'the present practice of infant baptism should be immediately abandoned' and replaced by 'a new joint service of baptism and confirmation, marking admission to Communion and "the congregation of Christ's flock"'. In such suggestions Mr. Payne feels that the Anabaptists would find at long last some vindication of their faith.

HAROLD S. DARBY

A History of the English Baptists, by A. C. Underwood. (Kingsgate Press, 12s. 6d.)

Dr. Underwood, Principal of Rawdon Baptist College, has gathered together in this book a good deal of valuable material and used it to tell an interesting story. He has wisely left untouched the vast fields of Wales and America, and has only mentioned the movement in Scotland and the work of the Baptist Missionary Society in so far as these influenced the Baptists in England. The title is, in fact, taken seriously, and the book has to do with English Baptists in England. The brief Foreword by Dr. Rushbrooke is a commendation of the book in his usual style—a style we shall miss. The book does not attempt to trace the tenuous thread that links the Puritan Baptists with the early days of the Church. We are spared those doubtful stepping-stones of Montanists, Novatianists, Paulicians, and Petrobrusians that earlier historians used to tread. The story begins with the Anabaptists on the Continent, and the controversial issue of our connexion with these rugged forebears is dealt with sanely and skilfully. The more reputable Northern members separated as the Mennonites, whose influence upon the English refugees in Holland is beyond question. A chapter is given to these early General Baptists. Then, quite separately, we are told of the Particular Baptists, who had no connexion at all with the Anabaptists of the Continent. The epic chapters of the book are the one covering the period 1640–60 and the following chapter on Renewed Persecution. These are brilliantly written and justify that part of the title which calls the book a 'History'. The long chapter covering the eighteenth century is lit up by the great figures that are rescued from this depressing period—Andrew Gifford, John Collett Ryland, John Ward, Thomas Guy, and others. It is frankly admitted that Baptists did not recognize the greatness of the Evangelical Revival but, as we are led to expect, there is a full account of Baptist Revival in the nineteenth century. We have had many biographies of great Baptist leaders, but few accounts of the Baptist movement during the last century. Here there was an opportunity, but Dr. Underwood has chosen the easier path, and gives us a series of pleasant pen portraits. For a younger man the book loses its hold after the opening of the nineteenth century, but no doubt many older readers will delight in portraits of men they knew in their childhood or whose names they heard whispered in their homes. The book closes with an account of the principal issues facing Baptists today, and we are left in no doubt where the writer stands in regard to them.

E. H. ROBERTSON

How Methodism Came: The Beginnings of Methodism in England and America, by Ruthella Mary Bibbins. (Baltimore Methodist Historical Society, \$1.75.)

For well over a century American Methodists have debated the question of the birthplace of Methodism in the United States. New York, with its Society organized in 1766 by Philip Embury, has traditionally held the field. The champions of Maryland, however, have claimed that Robert Strawbridge commenced a Methodist Society there at least two or three years earlier. (In either event, the pioneers were Irish emigrants.) In 1916 an official commission was set up to investigate the matter, but conclusive documentary evidence could not be brought forward. In

Mrs. Bibbins's book, in spite of a certain amount of special pleading, Maryland's claims are greatly strengthened. The writer, of Maryland descent, had given a lifetime of research to the problem, but she died before making her final summing-up. From the mass of her papers, the editors, Dr. R. L. Shipley and the Rev. G. P. Baker, have patiently and skilfully pieced together a work which has some of the defects of such a posthumous publication, but which is nevertheless a valuable contribution toward the understanding of American Methodism, especially for the new light which it throws on the pioneering work of Robert Strawbridge. The most valuable chapters are undoubtedly those on the origins of Methodism in New York and Maryland, which abound in the fruits of original research, and those on the crucial Christmas Conference of 1784, when the Methodist Episcopal Church of America was organized. The volume has numerous illustrations and a very full index of persons, though it suffers from the lack of an index of places. FRANK BAKER

The Wesleys Came to Dublin, by R. Lee Cole. (Epworth Press, 1s.)

Methodism in Scotland: The First Hundred Years, by Wesley F. Swift. (Epworth Press, 3s. 6d.)

The Man Who Wanted the World: the Story of Thomas Coke, by Cyril J. Davey. (Cargate Press, 3s. 6d.)

Mr. Cole's little book was written to commemorate the bicentenary of the landing of John Wesley in Dublin on the 9th August 1747. While readers of his *History of Methodism in Dublin* may be disappointed because the volume is so slight, it well fulfils its purpose, for it is meant for popular consumption. It deals mainly with the arrival of the Wesley brothers in Dublin, but earlier Methodist contacts with the city are mentioned, and the contemporary background is ably sketched in. Nor does Mr. Cole omit an evaluation of the far-reaching results of the venture. His study is greatly enriched by the fruits of additional research carried out since the publication of his larger volume.

Methodism in Scotland, the Wesley Historical Society lecture for 1947, is a more ambitious book, and one which fills a serious gap in the history of Methodism. For the first time we are enabled to see in broad outline the chequered career of Wesley and his preachers in a land which did not provide congenial soil for the itinerant ministry. Though prominence is naturally given to John Wesley's own contacts with Scotland, Mr. Swift writes as historian, not as panegyrist. Wesley's rather unhappy controversy with Dr. John Erskine is carefully described, as well as the ordination of Methodist preachers for Scotland in 1785—'an important, decisive, and, indeed, a despairing step'. Wesley's preachers are given a well-deserved chapter to themselves, enlivened by extracts from their manuscript journals. Progress in Scotland, both during Wesley's lifetime and after his death, was painful and slow, and even the steady progress which was made, was almost dissipated by the extravagant building schemes of Valentine Ward. In consequence, Scottish Methodism was a continuous drain on English pockets, and Jabez Bunting was moved to say, 'I think if Methodism in Scotland were put up to auction, it would be the best thing that could be done with it!' This book tells a fascinating story in a fascinating way. It is also a model of industry, for from many manuscript sources the author has compiled 'potted' histories of most of the Methodist chapels in Scotland and has packed much valuable information into four appendices.

Dr. Thomas Coke is too little known by the Methodist people, partly because of the inadequate and uninteresting biographies from which his memory has suffered. *The Man Who Wanted the World* is a happy corrective. It admirably performs what it sets out to do—to give a picture of the Father of Methodist Missions which is both comprehensive and alive. The book does not purport to be a work of extensive

original research, and indeed there are occasional slight errors of historical fact—as when Mr. Davey speaks of the first Irish Conference as being held in 1782—yet much material hitherto known only to students is here made readily and readably available for the general readers of all ages. Coke's exciting voyages across the Atlantic, his adventures with privateers, the romance of his wanderings in the West Indies, the pathos of his last appeal to the Methodist Conference for support in his projected mission to the East—all these and many other aspects of his life are pictured with real charm. While the emphasis is on Coke the missionary, Mr. Davey does not overlook his other activities—as Wesley's lieutenant in organizing the work in the British Isles, as a pioneer of Home Missions and Sunday Schools, and as co-founder with Asbury of the Methodist Episcopal Church of America. The book is made the more attractive and valuable by its illustrations, which include a facsimile of the first page of Coke's *Plan of the Society for the Establishment of Christianity among the Heathens*, a forerunner of William Carey's printed appeal for overseas missions.

FRANK BAKER

The American Churches, an Interpretation, by W. Warren Sweet. (Epworth Press, 5s.)

This book is the Beckley Lecture of 1946. In it Dr. W. W. Sweet, of Chicago University, provides an historical survey of the interaction between the Churches and the social and economic changes in the life of the American people. In particular he traces the development of what he calls 'left-wing Protestantism', a phrase that he uses to describe the liberal and evangelical religious movements from the Reformation onward. He asserts that 'all the great concepts for which American democracy stands today—individual rights, freedom of conscience, freedom of speech, self-government, complete religious liberty—are concepts coming out of the left-wing phase of the Reformation'. This quotation shows what he means by 'left-wing'. It is his claim that of all Protestant Churches none has given so much attention to the practical application of the Christian message to society as have those of the United States. He finds one of the roots of this American emphasis upon social Christianity in the frontier experiences of pioneers. It was there that they learned the necessity of applying Christian principles to society. The frontier churches, for instance, disciplined their members both for personal lapses in conduct and for wrongful business dealings. 'Thus . . . when new frontiers arose, created by the new industrial developments and the rise of the great cities, the movement to bring religion to bear upon the new social problems thus created was not something new but was simply the revival of a frontier emphasis applied to a much more complicated and difficult social situation.' The movement to put religion to work to reform the social order has met with opposition and it suffered a tremendous set-back in the confusion after the first world war, when many gave ear to a pessimistic theology emphasizing man's impotence. But, Dr. Sweet cries: 'God pity us and the world if the time ever comes when we shall throw all the burden on the Lord and fold the hands and acquiesce.'

J. VERNON RADCLIFFE

What are the Churches Doing?, by John Foster. (Religious Education Press, 5s.)

Hibbert Houses, by R. H. Mottram. (Lindsay Press, 1s. 6d.)

Dr. Foster's book, a selection of his popular wireless talks on the world-wide Church, is a chunk of Church history right up to date. His experience as a missionary in China and more recently as Professor of Church History at the Selly Oak Colleges, has given him the breadth of outlook necessary to such a task. He casts his net very wide. We are taken from the rebuilding of Coventry Cathedral to Bishop Azariah's vision of a United Church in South India—from mediation in the Liverpool Dock strike to the making of religious films and production of religious drama—from 'running' youth clubs in London to teaching Africans to read. There are some particularly moving chapters, notably the account of the heroic witness of the Karens in Burma

and the self-sacrificing work of Madeleine Barot among the internees of the French. There is a good chapter on service chaplains, but nothing about such work of the Christian pacifists as the 'running' of a club for tramps under the Hungerford Bridge during the blitz, or the Pacifist Service Unit's patient work on an L.C.C. housing estate. It is easy, however, to notice omissions. We are very grateful to Dr. Foster for the rich mosaic he has given us. Leaders of Youth Clubs would find excellent material here for the kind of short talk they give in epilogues.

Mr. R. H. Mottram's account of the Unitarian Church's provision of Service Hostels in the Near East—a blend of the factual and the personal—tells the story of an equally notable enterprise at greater length. Incidentally it helps the more orthodox among us to understand the Unitarian position. These two books would be good reading for introspective and self-satisfied congregations.

LESLIE M. WOLLEN

A Functional Approach to Religious Education, by Ernest J. Chave. (Cambridge University Press, 14s.)

Christianity and Adolescence, by Désirée Edwards-Rees. (Religious Education Press, 4s.)

A Child's Approach to Christianity, by Hilda J. Rostrom. (Religious Education Press, 9d.)

In the first book the Professor of Religious Education in the Divinity School of the University of Chicago sets out an analysis of religion under what he conceives to be its ten basic functions, and from this analysis develops a curriculum for religious education. The two great handicaps to the effective functioning of religion in the modern world are, he asserts, sectarianism and *supernaturalism*! It follows that 'the Hebraic-Christian tradition should give way to religious education based on the only possible way of redemption for responsible persons, the processes of growth'. Professor Chave's ten categories are the sense of worth, social sensitivity, appreciation of the universe, discrimination of values, responsibility and accountability, co-operative fellowship, the quest for truth and realization of values, integration of experiences into a working philosophy of life, appreciation of historical continuity, and participation in group celebrations. On this basis the author works out a system of ethical training with great ability. In an appendix he outlines an experimental curriculum for a three-year cycle of lessons. His functional analysis of religion, however, is inadequate, and, of course, the 'religion' he would teach lacks the dimensions both of Christian truth and of its power.

With the second book Miss Edwards-Rees—Further Education Officer to the Lancashire County Council, for many years Youth Organizer to the West Riding, and herself a club leader—completes a trilogy of which the *Service of Youth Book* and *A Rural Youth Service* were the previous volumes. As before, she writes from the depths of wide experience and with an intimate understanding of adolescents that helps readers to sympathize with them and appreciate their difficulties. From a discussion of the way in which we learn by 'habit-discipline' and standards, she turns to consider the demands made upon adolescents by the five great loyalties of home, work, neighbourhood, nation, and Church, and their emotional, physical, mental, and spiritual development. The author believes in plain, practical methods, and above all in the grace of Christ. All who have to deal with Youth will value this book both for its firm grasp of Christian faith and its concrete guidance in the face of practical difficulties.

Since the mother is the child's first teacher and is almost completely responsible for the first impressions made on its malleable mind, Miss Rostrom's simple book, dealing with the religious education of the child in its first five years, should be a great blessing to mothers. Within its short compass there is much practical wisdom.

RALPH KIRBY

The Stamp of Nature: The Study of Parental and Family Influences, by Dallas Kenmare. (Williams and Norgate, 8s. 6d.)

Christian Courtship, by Charles J. Clarke. (Epworth Press, 6d.)

Miss Dallas Kenmare, who in *The Philosophy of Love* made a valuable contribution to our understanding of the relationships between men and women, has now turned her attention to the influence of parents over their children. Her new book, *The Stamp of Nature*, ruthlessly dispels the sentimental aura in which motherhood and fatherhood have been traditionally enveloped. With stern realism she insists that parents, cloaking blind and selfish possessiveness under the guise of love, have often ruined the lives of their children. Her attack is concentrated upon the tragedy of young people of the 'introverted, highly-sensitive, artistic type', whose parents show no understanding of their needs and often try to stifle the spark of genius within them. As instances she quotes Ruskin, Kierkegaard, D. H. Lawrence, Elizabeth Barrett Browning, Nietzsche, Schumann, and others. She also cites case histories from the circle of her own acquaintance. While her aim is to present the problem rather than to arrive at final conclusions, she makes some radical proposals. 'Every woman should be deeply, unflinchingly honest with herself before she decides to bear a child.' It is confidently suggested that some women will realize that they are unfitted for motherhood and must eschew it. Children, too, must face realities. 'There is actually no reason why children should love their parents and relations, in any personal sense . . . and for this, it must be remembered, *no one is to blame*.' Surprising as it may seem, all this is linked closely with Christianity, though Miss Kenmare is amongst those who have misgivings about institutional religion and dogmatic theology. Our Lord's stern command that mother and father may have to be 'hated' and forsaken for the Gospel's sake provides the clue. The fulfilment of personal destiny, and the quest of love springing, not from duty, but from natural affinity, must override the authority of parental and family influence. 'The Voice of God, the inner voice, speaks insistently to every man, but if he refuses to listen, refuses to make the response God asks, he is lost as a free personality, a free man, and becomes a slave, a pawn in the hands of the world.' Much is being written in these days about the spiritual reinterpretation of human love and personal relationships. This tendency, based on the bankruptcy of secular psychology, is all to the good. Miss Kenmare's book may be unorthodox, but it is stimulating, challenging, and sincere. It shows evidence of wide reading and deep reflection, and, despite a tendency to irrelevant digression, it is well written.

Christian Courtship, a booklet written by a Methodist minister for Christian youth, is short and to the point. It says what needs to be said about Friendship, Courtship, Betrothal, and Marriage. Its simplicity and sincerity make it suitable for all who have embraced the Christian way of life. No other booklet quite covers the same ground, and this one will be very useful to ministers, parents, and youth leaders who are looking for something suitable to place in the hands of their young men and women.

DAVID R. MACE

From Failure to Fulfilment, by John Martin. (Allen & Unwin, 7s. 6d.)

This book is described as a Minister's Notebook on Psychological Method. It is written, as Mr. Weatherhead reminds us in the Foreword, out of a wide experience of handling psychological disorders. The author's approach is that of the personal counsellor rather than that of the expert psychiatrist, and his purpose is to point to a way in which ministers may help those in need without 'poaching' on medical 'preserves'. He writes, 'While the minister has no desire to trespass upon the province of any other calling, certainly not that of a doctor, he cannot but feel that his own

calling, which is touched so intimately by these problems, ought to have some other word to say than that of baffled sympathy', and he has tried to map out, with some measure of success, the field in which the psychologically equipped minister can co-operate with the psychiatrist. To say that we still await a book defining the limitations of co-operation between psychiatrist and parson, is in no sense to disparage Mr. Martin's effort. It is significant that, at a moment when ministers are keenly interested in psychological methods of healing, many leading psychiatrists are concentrating on the study of spiritual methods of healing. They are convinced that we are on the verge of immense discoveries, and that by patient, prayerful research, laws of healing will be revealed that will by-pass our present physical and psychological methods. Is it here that the Church ought to be concentrating its efforts, rather than on psychological healing? *Spiritual* healing is plainly the minister's job. Yet it is essential that he should be psychologically well-equipped. If he is not, he may make many tragic and criminal mistakes. A schizophrenic, for instance, may apparently joyfully accept his spiritual counsel, and rise from prayer with his depression lifted, and yet commit suicide on the way home. A minister who cannot diagnose a psychosis had better leave personal counselling alone. While this book would be greatly improved by cutting out many unnecessary words, and while the Preface, which is not well written, should be read at the end, many ministers will be grateful to Mr. Martin for a book that will awaken psychological insight and afford some guidance in dealing with minor personality disorders.

T. METCALF

ADDENDUM

The Great Religions of the Modern World, edited by Edward J. Jurji. (Princeton University Press, via Oxford Press, 215.)

This book, a symposium by nine authors, gives an account of the chief non-Christian religions, adding chapters on Eastern Orthodoxy, Romanism and Protestantism. Dr. Hodous contributes the chapters on Confucianism and Taoism and accepts the view that Lao Tzu was not the author of the latter system, for his only mention of that sage is in the sentence: 'The Tao Te Ching has been attributed to Lao Tzu of the sixth century B.C., but this is questioned.' He dates Taoism from 206 B.C. Dr. Archer's article on Hinduism faces a big subject in a restricted space as successfully as the conditions permit, but he has to treat Vedic religion briefly and to omit the modern reform movements. Dr. Rischauer, writing on Buddhism, has an even tighter piece of packing to face, but he gives a good account, on the usual lines, of the teaching of Gotama, though without mentioning the challenge the late Mrs. Rhys Davids made to the traditional interpretation. Dr. Holtom writes on Shinto, providing a useful account of the new Shinto after 1945. Dr. Jurji takes his own subject, Islam, in a good article to which an inadequate bibliography is added. Dr. Neuman contributes a comprehensive account of Judaism. Whether it is desirable to mingle Christian and non-Christian systems in one volume may be debated, but, as few English-speaking peoples know much of the Greek Church, Dr. Hromádka's article will prove interesting, especially as regards Russia. As to the articles on Roman Catholicism and Protestantism, a devout Hindu, shall we say, reading Dr. Walsh on the former and Dr. Mackay on the latter, might almost wonder what was the reason for the separation of the two, so carefully do both writers avoid the disputed issues. The book is too short to serve as a student's manual, but it does provide an admirable general account of the main features of the religions of mankind. It is not a mere record of facts, dogmas, sects, and so forth, but pictures the condition of the various religions today, even including, for example, Indian Islam and Pakistan.

E. S. WATERHOUSE

From My New Shelf

BY C. RYDER SMITH

Revelation and Reason, by Emil Brunner; Translated by Olive Wyon. (S.C.M., 25s.)

In this book Olive Wyon gives us a very welcome 'unabridged translation' of Brunner's *Offenbarung und Vernunft*, first published at Zurich in 1941. There is no need to say that the translation is well done. The order of the words in the title gives Brunner's point of view. He maintains that there is a place for reason in Christianity, but that, far from its being a court of appeal before which Christian faith must justify itself, it is itself only the servant of faith, helping us to understand in part, though not fully, what 'revelation' is. Brunner, of course, differs from Barth in allowing that there is such a thing as 'general revelation' at all. For him God gave this at the creation of man. Man, however, at once sinned, an 'incomprehensible' thing, and thereby ceased to be able to understand aright 'the everlasting power and divinity' of God (Romans 1st). It was not that man lost *all* knowledge of this, but only the *right* knowledge. By the light of the Spirit the Christian can trace some poor vestiges of this knowledge in the other religions, but fallen man cannot discern even them until he is redeemed through Christ. While Brunner does not abandon the existential creed that religion comes altogether by revelation and not at all by discovery, he admits two moments of revelation—one at the creation, and the other at the Incarnation. He distinguishes the two, subordinating the first to the second, by the claim that in the creation 'God, as personal, does not meet man personally, but impersonally'. The 'general revelation', therefore, 'cannot have any saving significance for the sinner'. Brunner denies that God 'confronts' man as person to person, either at the creation or at any point in history except one—when 'the Word became flesh'. The first part of his book is exposition and the second apologetic. Under the second he deals with all the main problems that vex the believer—e.g. 'the problem of doubt', 'the naturalistic theory of religion', Biblical criticism, 'Science and the Miracle of Revelation', such theories as atheism and pantheism, and so on. There is little or no polemic against Barth, though the main differences between the two are implied in footnotes. On the other hand, there is a good deal of polemic against Scholasticism, both Roman and Protestant. Brunner claims, like other existentialists, that the postulate of Scholasticism is that human reason is ultimate, and that this is idolatry. Spite all that Scholasticism says about the Supernatural, is not this true? The book is none the worse for rather numerous repetitions, especially as it is addressed to 'all thinking men and women who want to gain a clear view of the relation between Christianity and civilization'. Little is said directly of 'civilization', but for it the truth about religion is, of course, the finally decisive truth. There is very much of value in this wealthy book which cannot be noted here. For instance, how much is involved in the two sentences: 'A Church that consists only of hearers, and not of disciples, makes no impression on the world', 'The very idea of a "layman" is itself wholly of Catholic origin.' Toward the end there is a very good chapter on 'The two Conceptions of Truth' that draws together Brunner's main ideas, and the volume closes with a fine exposition of the evangelical faith. Brunner will be no party to the extrusion of the need for Repentance from Christianity. As to his distinctive doctrine, one may ask whether Barth is not right in claiming that Brunner, having gone so far, ought not to go farther—but wrong in claiming that he has already gone too far. Is it not possible to hold that in Christ there is the *unique culmination* of revelation, without claiming that outside the Bible there is no revelation of God *as person* at all? Brunner, of course, has something to say about this question, but one reader, at least, finds it inadequate.

Whither Theology? Some Essential Biblical Patterns, by William Robinson. (Lutterworth Press, 7s. 6d.)

The sub-title better describes these lectures than the title. Principal Robinson, a master of current trends in theology (as his footnotes, etc., show), presents here his own conclusions about them. He accepts the fundamental existential claim—that true religion begins with a 'personal encounter' between God and man and continues in a personal fellowship. Along with this there are the claims that the New Testament roots in the Old, that God is primarily the 'living God' of history, not the metaphysical God of Chalcedon, that the fundamental sin is man's attempt to be independent of God, that he needs to admit his creatureliness and utter dependence, that none the less God has given him a limited freedom, that salvation is altogether the personal gift of God through Christ, and that by accepting the gift through faith man attains the true liberty of a 'son'. The author does not discuss the problems that attend this series of tenets (though he has a useful summary of the difficulties of believing in the Providence of God), but the book is an able account of the beliefs that very many, who are by no means whole-hearted Barthians, are now accepting from the existential school. Principal Robinson rightly points out that the movement did not begin with Barth, and has never been confined to Barthians. He gives a very high place to Oman, for instance. Perhaps I may venture to say that when I read *Grace and Personality* many years ago, I said to myself: 'This book sets out, with great learning, ability, and skill, truths with which Methodists have been experimentally acquainted ever since 24th May 1738.' Surely if any man ever knew what a 'personal encounter' with Christ is, it was John Wesley. Yet Principal Robinson passes over the Evangelical Revival with the misleading comment: 'The old dogmatic truths were the basis of the experience.' Did not Wesley write (22nd May 1750): 'I hold nothing to be (strictly speaking) necessary to salvation but the mind which was in Christ'? Again, some details in the writer's account of the Old Testament might be queried. But this book answers admirably a question which many non-specialists are asking: 'What changes in the approach to theology ensue from the discussions of the last generation?'

Miracles, A Preliminary Study, by C. S. Lewis. (Geoffrey Bles, 10s. 6d.)

As the title suggests, this book does not deal with the historicity of particular miracles but with the questions 'Are miracles possible?' and 'Are they probable?' Most of the chapters 'face up' to 'naturalism'—the belief that 'nature' runs of itself—which, as Mr. Lewis warns his readers in an epilogue, has so thoroughly worked itself into the mental make-up of this generation that a man finds it all but impossible to rid himself of it. In twelve chapters Mr. Lewis sets himself to help him to do so (one of them, on the 'moral argument', being hardly apposite). When I was reading them, I found myself thinking of sheep-dog trials. The writer, with his customary adroitness, appears unexpectedly first at this point and then at that, until at last he has his readers quietly finding their way into the fold where he wants them. There is no need to say that Mr. Lewis uses very many illustrations, as pertinent as they are unusual, for he is an unrivalled adept in the argument from analogy. Once or twice he will seem to some readers to use well-nigh irreverent phrases, but he is only talking to the man who objects to such things as the Virgin Birth in the language that such men use. After these twelve chapters there are three others. In these Mr. Lewis, without ceasing to be a logician, shows how ardent is his Christian faith. The first is named 'The Grand Miracle' and deals with the Incarnation and its completion in the Atonement and Resurrection. In effect, the writer asks: 'If God is all that a Father ought to be, must not His Son have become man, and, if He did, what limit can be put to His power?' It is clear that Mr. Lewis, who himself was once a devotee of 'naturalism', now believes, for instance, that Jesus did calm a storm, did raise

Lazarus from the grave, and, after His Resurrection, did eat of 'boiled [sic] fish'. In the other two chapters Christ's miracles are divided into two classes—'Miracles of the Old Creation' and 'Miracles of the New Creation'. By the 'New Creation' Mr. Lewis means the new universe that Christ will ultimately make, and of which there are anticipations in the 'mighty works' that He wrought in 'the days of His flesh'. In the second of these chapters he dares to develop certain Pauline hints which most writers leave much where Paul left them. He suggests, for instance, that in the new universe—which will include this one re-made—there may be a form of human existence which is neither 'merely spiritual', as the phrase goes, nor 'flesh and blood'. Undoubtedly this is Paul's trend. There are useful appendixes on the varied meanings of 'spirit' and 'spiritual' and on 'special providences'. For the most part Mr. Lewis skilfully turns the technicalities of philosophy into current speech, but even he can hardly achieve this when he seeks to show that, if 'eternity' is 'timeless', the idea that in a miracle God 'interrupts' nature has no meaning. He, of course, assumes that there is such a thing as 'natural theology'. None of your Barthianism for him! Perhaps he might have made more of two truths—first, that in every living thing there is something of miracle, since there is something of novelty: and second, that multitudes of ordinary Christians have experienced the miracle of a personal meeting with Christ. To quote his own definition (which is not mine), are not both these 'interferences with Nature by supernatural power'? But the book proves its main point—that it is absurd to say with a shrug: 'There are no miracles.'

The School of Manhood, by Dorothy Wilson. (S.C.M., 6s.)

What—No Belief?, by Douglas P. Blatherwick. (Epworth Press, 3s.)

The main purpose of both these books is to persuade young men and women that the Christian life is the one kind of life worth living. Except in purpose, they are very different. Miss Wilson is a minister, Mr. Blatherwick a layman. Dr. Hugh Martin, that skilful selector, asked Miss Wilson to write a book about 'the more personal side of religion'; Mr. Blatherwick has written just because, when he came home disabled from the war, he could hardly help it. Miss Wilson uses very effective quotations from such people as Canon Streeter, Professor H. H. Farmer and Miss Dorothy Sayers; Mr. Blatherwick pours out anecdotes that have somehow stuck in his mind. The title of Miss Wilson's book (borrowed from Canon Streeter—'Life . . . is a school of manhood') describes the whole of it; Mr. Blatherwick's title is no more than a 'kick-off', for he 'aims at suggesting a basis' for the beliefs that he has himself found to 'work'. Miss Wilson's book is closely integrated; Mr. Blatherwick is a Christian pragmatist, who leaves his creed to integrate itself (which it will do). Miss Wilson's subject hardly allows her to mention the Church; Mr. Blatherwick has some challenging things to say to the Church he loves. (Miss Wilson might look up the context of Deuteronomy 30¹⁹, and Mr. Blatherwick of John 14⁶.) Yet 'There are diversities of gifts but the same Spirit'—and both these books are 'right on the nail'.

The Byzantine Patriarchate, 451-1204, by George Every. (S.P.C.K., 12s. 6d.)

An up-to-date study of the 'Greek' Church in the period covered by this book has long been overdue, and Father Every has done his work well. It is true that the title of his book suggests a limited subject, but he has not found it possible to isolate the story of one Patriarchate overmuch. He is master of all the materials that have been accumulating in the last generation, as his multitude of references show. Indeed, if a criticism were to be offered on his volume it would be that a reader who has not already some knowledge of the subject might hardly be able to 'see the wood for the trees'. He adds, it is true, lists of Patriarchs, Popes, and Emperors, but by themselves these give hardly enough guidance to beginners. Of course, too, he assumes

that his readers have some general knowledge of contemporary political history. There are four useful maps and eight pages of excellent illustrations. (On p. 103 a superfluous 'not' has crept into the text, and on p. 204 the date for Anatolius has gone astray.) While the book deals with all relevant questions, Father Every shows special interest in the subject of Church unity. He keeps this in mind whether dealing with Christological schisms or Iconoclasm or the division of East and West. It is under the last topic that he makes his most notable contribution to a revision of old opinions. He shows that the climax of a long-maturing quarrel came, not in the ninth or eleventh century, but at the beginning of the thirteenth. More than ever it seems clear that the Fourth Lateran Council is the pivot of medieval Church history. The real ground of the final division was not the *Filioque*, which at times was hardly more than a convenient label, but the explicit claim of Innocent III to be, no mere *primus inter pares*, but supreme over the whole Church. No doubt there were earlier anticipations of this Papal claim, but now at last it was uncompromisingly and finally made. Some, at least, of the other important subjects of the period are also very much alive today, though Father Every 'sticks to his last' and leaves the reader to draw his own parallels. For instance, in the Byzantine Church the Emperors were neither clergy nor mere laymen—and the State had very much to do with the control of the Church. The absence of great names in the list of eighty-one Patriarchs is not unrelated to this. Again, the Totalitarian issue is raised, without the name, in more than one way. Or again, is there not a hint of informal democracy in the fundamental appeal of the East to the *consensus* of all believers (as expressed in General Councils)? Here, as elsewhere, the Russian Church is heir of Byzantium. Father Every also gives us many interesting sidelights on details—for example, he shows us a Pope replying to the question of a Barbarian king, 'Can a Christian wear trousers?' (was it not rather '(knee-)breeches?') He also brings out the truth that some, though not all, of the seemingly small matters about which Christians quarrelled were not really 'frivolous', but outward signs of deep differences. For instance, when the Iconoclasts maintained that, while there was no harm in depicting a hunting scene, it was wrong to picture the Risen Christ in human form, Asiatic Christians were protesting against what they thought an undue emphasis on the humanity of our Lord. We are thankful to the author for this very competent book.

Peter Abelard, the Orthodox Rebel, by Roger Lloyd. (Latimer Press, 10s. 6d.)

This book is almost a reprint of a volume published in 1932 under the title, *The Stricken Lute*. Canon Lloyd says: 'I have almost nothing I wish to alter.' He does what can be done to tell the general reader what Abelard's philosophical and theological controversies were about, except that he does not explain the term 'Conceptualist', and he writes as if Abelard's doctrine of the Atonement had 'swept the boards'. He describes the twelfth-century background very well, especially showing how Abelard is best understood as a leader in the development of the Universities. He rightly claims that after his death Abelard won the battle for the use of reason in theology, though he might have added that this conflict is again upon us. But the book is at its best in telling the fatal story of the love of Abelard and Heloise, and this is where this man and this woman are unique.

Philip of Spain and the Netherlands, by Cecil John Cadoux. (Lutterworth Press, 18s.)

Professor Cadoux begins with a chapter on 'Moral Judgements in History', for his book is an 'essay' on this subject. His conclusion, broadly speaking, is that acts may be wrong even though the men who did them may have honestly followed their conscience. Next, he has a chapter on 'Catholic Revaluations in History', where he animadverts on a good many reviews in *The Times Literary Supplement*, and then mentions the two books that were the immediate cause of his essay. The first of these is

a volume on *Philip II* by an American Catholic layman, Dr. W. T. Walsh. If it were not necessary sometimes to pursue a writer's mistakes point by point, one could wish that Dr. Cadoux had been content to display Dr. Walsh's unhistorical bias by a few glaring examples and then had left him alone. The other book, Rev. R. Trevor Davies' *The Golden Century of Spain, 1501-1621*, is another matter. Dr. Cadoux might have made it clearer that this volume is an account of the whole history of Spain in her great century and that it deals with the religious question only as part of a larger whole. Yet there is no doubt that Mr. Davies' book does exhibit the current tendency among many non-Catholic writers to say all that can be said in favour of Catholics and everything possible against Protestants. A writer, striving to be fair to his enemies, may be unfair to his friends. Again, Mr. Davies does not give the evidence for some of his most severe verdicts—e.g. on William of Orange. Professor Cadoux, assuming that his readers have some knowledge of the Netherlands' story, devotes eight chapters to his main theme, dealing with such subjects as the Inquisition, Alva, and the Personal Characters of Philip and William. No doubt he will be accused of Protestant bias, but he shows this in a few details at most. He freely admits, for instance, that Philip followed his conscience throughout, and he describes the serious flaws on the Protestant side. But he claims, and makes out his claim, that on the whole the Protestants erred less than the Catholics and that it was the latter that 'began it' every time. In his Preface he refers to Dr. Renier's work on *The Dutch Nation* and allows that this book shows that the very complex political structure of the Provinces of the Netherlands was very far from democratic, but he is not the only reader who none the less finds in Dr. Renier's volume evidence that the Provinces were one of the seed-plots of democracy, and he rightly claims that it is in Protestant lands that the modern virtue of tolerance had its roots, and that the Roman Church has never admitted, as Protestants do, that the cruelties of religious persecution are an abomination unto the Lord. As one would expect, Dr. Cadoux cannot leave his subject without a word in favour of pacifism, but there is no doubt that he has done a very necessary (though not very agreeable) service to historical accuracy.

Grimshaw of Haworth, by George G. Cragg. (Canterbury Press, 6s.)

'I can, harmoniously as matters have hitherto been carried on, be a minister of our Church and a Methodist preacher, and thus I could wish to live and die', wrote Grimshaw. Perhaps he and Fletcher of Madeley were the only two Anglican clergymen who altogether succeeded in this endeavour, and he would have found it hard if he had lived twenty years longer. He has been too long forgotten, save for two stories, neither of which depicts the real man. Mr. Cragg's book rightly takes a wide ambit. He not only shows us Haworth itself, but, with effective help from Defoe, describes the ways of King Wool on the Yorkshire fells and in the Yorkshire dales and takes us over the vague tracks of Blackstone Edge in a snow-storm. He has a chapter on 'Grimshaw's Men', for the Haworth Curate took charge of the great Haworth Round, sometimes appointing preachers himself. In another chapter he tells of Grimshaw's friends, Venn and Ingham, two very different Evangelical incumbents, who also 'went about' in the West Riding 'preaching the word'. But of course Grimshaw himself, 'a broad-set, sharp-looking little man', is the chief subject. We see him blacking his many visitors' boots, drawing up his personal Covenant with God, speaking in 'market language' to people in church, cottage, and the open-air, visiting his stricken people till he himself dies of a 'putrid fever'. There are a few errors in details—for instance, it was Charles Wesley who 'founded the Holy Club' and Pawson was President (not Chairman) of the Conference—but Mr. Cragg has done his work well. His book is a needed complement to the story of the Wesleys and Whitefield and it will warm the heart of every evangelical reader.

The History of the Salvation Army, Vol. I, 1865-78, by Robert Sandall. (Nelson & Sons, 10s. 6d.)

The Salvation Army was not called 'The Salvation Army' till it was thirteen years old. It had already had three other names. This volume tells the story of those thirteen years. It is the first volume of the authoritative history. Happily General Bramwell Booth set someone to collect materials before the veterans of the first years had all passed away, and Colonel Sandall has used the materials well. He gives us first-hand evidence, going into considerable detail as he tells how 'the East London Mission' almost grew of itself. It began when William Booth consented to take temporary charge of a mission that was being held in an old tent on a disused Quaker burial ground in Whitechapel. 'A grain of mustard seed!' The writer has resisted the temptation to make the story one more account of the Booths. Here is a 'great cloud of witnesses', with pictures of a good many of them and stories galore. It is a surprise to find that some, at least, of the early evangelists carried on their work in frock coats and top-hats! As one reads the accounts of the holes and corners where they 'laboured in the Lord' one can almost smell the stink. No other word is adequate. But these were the places where the 'lowest of the low', if a Christian may use the phrase, would come, lice and all. The 'publicans and sinners' would have nothing to do with 'respectable' Christians and their chapels, but they felt at home with a converted chimney-sweep in a garret off a passage in a back street. William Booth, of course, did not keep all his converts, but he saw very soon that under the slogan 'saved to save' he could sort out the wheat from the chaff—and there was much wheat. In the second part of the book most space is given to the wider subject of the development of the Mission. If ever a man 'felt his way' in such things, William Booth did so. Little is said—and it is said charitably—of his relations with the Methodists, for the story begins when he had become 'a free-lance'. None the less not a few Methodist phrases are here—such as 'leader', 'plan' and 'General Superintendent'. The said Superintendent toiled to make a Conference—but it was no use. His principal helpers soon saw this, and he himself, at first silently, saw it too. The upshot was that he said to the last Conference: 'Confidence in God and in me are absolutely indispensable both now and ever afterwards.' It was not blasphemy, but true. The Salvation Army is 'totalitarian'—by the consent of its soldiers. Christianity is not tied to any one type of organization. One is tempted to say much else, for this is an opulent book, and it has not a little to teach the Churches. There is Railton, for instance, who stands next to the two Booths in the formative years. Or again, how tempting it is to expatiate on the sentence 'The dreadful tendency to settle down is apparent in connexion with all religious work'! Then there is the explicit Trinitarian creed. I once heard General Booth preach in a Leeds theatre. I can see his lithe figure now, beard awag, as he piled up the 'works of the devil' on the stage for 'the Son of God' to 'destroy'. This book tells of the beginnings of the greatest Christian movement of the nineteenth century. There is careful 'documentation' and there are many appendices, but, General Osborn's foreword notwithstanding, this is not 'an official History', but a 'live' book.

Arthur Quiller-Couch, a Biographical Study of 'Q', by F. Brittain. (Cambridge Press, 15s.)

When Q died he was 'an institution', alike in Cornwall, at Cambridge, and in the world of English letters, and in all three he deserved his eminence. In Cornwall he was ready to do anything to serve, whether it were arranging a local pageant, or cutting the toe-nails of recruits in time of war, or serving for thirty years on the County Education Committee. On this Committee he could work in enthusiastic harness with a Local Preacher yet, to quote his own phrase, he could also 'fight with Local Preachers at Ephesus'. When Mr. Asquith appointed him Regius Professor of English at

Cambridge, many were surprised, but no man ever vindicated his appointment more amply. He made the English Tripos what it is, and both in lectures and less formal teaching 'bought up' his every opportunity. The world of letters owes him thirty volumes of novels and shorter stories, the famous *Oxford Books* of poetry and prose, the authoritative volumes on *The Art of Writing* (with its incomparable chapter on 'Jargon') and *The Art of Reading*, and such *parerga* as poems, light verse, and limericks. Mr. Brittain, who 'kept' in the story above him at Jesus College, passes comparatively briefly over his earlier years, for Q has told his own tale of these, but he adds that the young Quiller-Couch, a doctor's son, paid his father's debts off year by laborious year. Indeed, rather unexpectedly the reader finds himself saying: 'How hard he worked all his life!' There was nothing of the leisured dilettante about Q, yet nothing of the smell of 'midnight oil' either. Of course, Mr. Brittain has good stories to tell, for Q all but breathed humour. He has wisely included many well-chosen extracts from Q's various kinds of writing, and he shows us admirably how Q 'warmed both hands before the fire of life'. For instance, he was a yachtsman, a lover of gardens, and a judge of wine. He had a passion for colour—in the Fowey harbour, in a flower, and in clothes. One is not surprised to hear that he could not abide some of the poets of today. Mr. Brittain attempts no 'estimate' of Q's place in English literature, for he knows that this must await the years, but he does show us the man himself. And he seems to have done it as easily as Q seemed to write. He gives more than seven pages to a 'Chronological List of Q's Publications', but even this is incomplete under 'contributions to periodicals'. It is good to learn that he is preparing a 'representative selection' from them. This book is just what a book about a man of the immediate past should be.

BOOKLETS AND PAMPHLETS

The Epworth Press has issued seven pamphlets, each apt to its purpose. First, there is the President's Conference address, *The Call of the Countryside* (4d.). The politicians are crying 'Back to the Land'; here is the parallel and clamant challenge to the Church. Next, there is the Vice-President's address, Professor Victor Murray's *Security of Church and State* (4d.), with its Burke-like analysis of our 'present discontents' and its firm grasp on God. Third, there is a reprint of Professor C. H. Dodd's article *Christian Beginnings* (6d.) in which, not without irony, he shows how mistaken Bishop Barnes's recent account of the 'Rise of Christianity' is. Fourth, in *The First Claim on our Evangelism* (3d.), Rev. Edgar P. Blamires shows how tens of thousands of children from Christian homes drift from the Church every year and urges that baptism ought to imply Church membership. Fifth, Rev. Eric G. Frost, rightly believing that Free Church worship would gain by a large use of Congregational Responses, has provided in *The Words of My Mouth* (9d.) ten excellent examples, each centred in one of the chief elements in worship. Sixth, the *Historical Tablets* (2s.) that face the visitor to 'the New Room in the Horsefair' at Bristol, are put into print, with portraits of Wesley and Asbury. Finally, Dr. F. W. Boreham tells us more about his beloved 'Mosgiel people' in *O'er Crag and Torrent* (9d.), and answers the question 'Is all this fact or fiction?'

Those who like collections of Bible passages on various subjects ready to their hand will find just what they want in D. M. Miller's *Topical Bible Concordance* (Lutterworth Press, 5s.). He characterizes every passage. . . . Dr. G. Stephen Spinks is editing a series of booklets on 'The Religious Life' for the Lindsey Press (6d. each). In the first number, which he has himself written under the title *The Quiet Mind*, he shows how we all have both a 'Martha' and a 'Mary' within us, and how a wise man will give 'Mary' her right place in life. In the second number, *After This Manner*, Mr. Leonard Mason, starting from what Jesus said and implied about prayer, interprets it in terms

of 'a spiritual affinity with the Great Power implicit in creation'. . . . *Sacraments, a Quaker View* (Friends House, 2s. 6d.) is practically a reprint of a pamphlet written in 1924 by the late Alfred Kemp Brown. Starting from the New Testament, and surveying the history of the Two Sacraments in the Christian centuries since, it is a masterly account of 'the Quaker position', both on its negative and positive sides. . . . *John Wesley*, by W. Leathern, and *Charles Wesley*, by Frank Colquhoun, are two numbers in the *Great Churchmen* series (Church Book Room Press, 9d. each). The one is an encomium of 'the greatest churchman of the English-speaking peoples' and the other of 'the prince of English hymn-writers'. The two authors do not say much of controversies but give themselves to enthusiastic but just praise. Here and there Mr. Leathern's prose might be mended. These Anglican booklets 'put first things first'. . . . In Charles Jeffries' curiously named *Nebuchadnezzar's Image* (S.P.C.K., 1s. 3d.) an Anglican layman tells in laymen's language the story of the divisions of the Church and the movements toward reunion. He is not always well-informed—for example, Paul did not 'found' the Roman Church, and where are the people who think that the Church is just 'a collection of individual persons who profess to be Christians'? But in the main the writer does give laymen a clear, untechnical account of his subject, and his temper is admirable. . . . Mr. W. G. Tarrant's *Story and Significance of the Unitarian Movement* (Lindsey Press, 1s. 6d.) is a reprint of the Essex Lecture of 1910 brought up to date. Unhappily it is largely a story of persecution. It is comprehensive, accurate, and clear. . . . In *Shall we Follow Karl Barth?* (Lindsey Press, 1s. 6d.) Mr. Sidney Spencer sets out usefully Barth's chief doctrines, noting changes. He criticizes from the point of view of 'Liberal' theology of the mystical type.

NOTABLE ARTICLES IN PERIODICALS

The Expository Times, September (T. & T. Clark, 1s. 3d.).

The Unity of the New Testament: The Doctrine of the Church, by A. Raymond George.

do., October.

The Context of the Gospel Story, by Roderic Dunkerley.

Marriage in the Bible: The Old Testament Foundation, by A. S. Herbert.

The Marcan Parable of the Child in the Midst, by Matthew Black.

do., November.

The Validity of Religious Experience, by H. L. Stewart.

Jesus Christ, Natural and Supernatural, by O. T. Owen.

Marriage in the Bible: II. The New Testament, by A. H. Curtis.

The International Review of Missions, October (Oxford Press, 3s.).

The Church in a Revolutionary World, by Bishop S. C. Neill.

The Given Word: The Message of the Unvarying Gospel, by John Baillie.

The Articulate Word: The Problem of Communication, by D. G. Moses, W. Freytag, T. C. Chao, and H. P. van Dusen.

The Holy Spirit in Fellowship, by Lootfy Levonian.

Christian Medical Education in India, by R. G. Cochrane.

Studies in Philology, July 1947 (University of North Carolina, via Cambridge Press, \$1.25).

A New Interpretation of Crétien's Conte del Graal, by Urban T. Holmes, Jun.

Notes on the Greek in *Dante's Latin Dictionary*, by H. D. Austin.

Anonymous Critic of Milton: Richard Leigh or Samuel Butler?, by Paul B. Anderson.

On the Death of Mrs. Killigrew: The Perfecting of a Genre, by Ruth Wallerstein.

Tennyson's Merlin, by Gordon S. Haight.

The Presbyterian, Third Quarter (J. Clarke, 1s.).

The Church in England and the Church of England, by A. R. Vidler.

The Church's Commission in the World, by F. W. Krummacker.

Supralapsarianism (and Barth), by Arthur N. Prior.

Bibliotheca Sacra, July-September (Dallas Theological Seminary, \$2.30 per annum).

Soteriology (The Governmental Theory), by L. Sperry Chafer.

Literal Interpretation, by J. H. Bennetch.

Protestant Theology since 1700 (contd.), by Miner B. Stearns.

The Puritan Philosophy of Education (in U.S.A.), by Earle E. Cairns.

The Congregational Quarterly, October (Independent Press, 2s. 6d.).

Presbyterian-Congregational Union?, by S. Maurice Watts, A. J. Grieve, G. F. Nuttall, and a Layman.

Thomas Mann's 'Joseph and His Brethren', by G. Vaughan Jones.

A National Wage Policy, by J. J. Gracie.

Contemporary Protestant Thought in France, by D. R. Haggis.

Temperament, Character, and Neurosis, by H. J. S. Guntrip.

Das Zeichen der Zeit, Heft 6 (Evangelische Verlagsanstalt GmbH., Berlin No. 18, Georgenkirchstr. 70; RM. 16 per annum).

Warum Christentum und Sozialismus einander begegnen müssen, by Aurel von Jüchen.

Gottes entscheidender Eingriff in die Weltgeschichte, by Gustav Stählin.

Die Ikone: das Heiligenbild der Ostkirche, by Konrad Onasch.

Entwurf einer Ordnung der Evangelischen Kirche in Deutschland (Darmstadt Plan).

Die Kirche und das politische Wollen (Asmussen and Barth), by Wolfgang Scherffig.

do., Heft 7.

Gott und die Geschichte bei Luther, by Martin Doerne.

Aufgaben neuer Kirchenordnung (1), by Friedrich K. Schumann.

Die Kirchenversammlung zu Treysa, 1947, by M. Albertz and E. F. von Rabenau.

do., Heft 8/9.

Apocalypticische Zeit?, by Heinrich Vogel.

Glauben heisst Bekennen, by Karl Barth.

Aufgaben neuer Kirchenordnung (2), by Friedrich K. Schumann.

Barock-Leute: zu Elisabeth Langgässers neuem Werk, by Hans Urner.

Unterwegs, Heft 2, 1947 (Berlin-Reinickendorf-Ost, Breitkopfstr. 140, RM. 2).

Jesus Christus ist auferstanden, by Karl Barth.

Was heisst ökumenisch?, by Rudolf Weckerling.

Ist das Entsakularisierung der Welt?

Das Zeichen des Jona (ein Spiel), first part, by Günter Rutenborn.

do., Heft 3, 1947.

Sinn und Verheissung der Predigt, by Walter Lüthi.

Illegalität aus Verantwortung, by Helene Jacobs.

Bilder aus der Arbeit der illegalen Judenhilfe, by Gertrud Staewen.

Das Zeichen des Jona (ein Spiel), second part, by Günter Rutenborn.

do., Heft 4, 1947.

Christus im Drama der Welt, by Bishop Berggrav.

Die Kirche: die lebendige Gemeinde des lebendigen Herrn Jesus Christus, by Karl Barth.

Christus und wir Christen, by Karl Barth.

Discussion mit Professor Karl Barth am 5 August 1947.

Religion in Life, Summer (Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, via Epworth Press, 9s. 6d. per annum).

Liberalism and Neo-Orthodoxy, by Willard L. Sperry.

Thunder on the Right (U.S.A. and U.S.S.R.), by W. Howard Melish.

Thomas Hardy's Disbelief, by Norvin Hein.

Toward a New Synthesis, by Oliver Read Whitley.

Hymn Patterns, by Carl F. Price.

The Journal of Religion, July (Chicago University Press, via Cambridge Press, \$1.50).

The Place of the History of Religions in the Study of Theology, by Joachim Wach.

A Theory of Virtue according to the Principles of the Reformation (Augustine, Aquinas, etc.), by Paul Ramsey.

Puritan of Carthage (Tertullian), by Morton S. Enslin.

The Yale Review, Autumn (Yale University Press, via Cumberledge, \$1).

Churches and Civilizations, by Arnold Toynbee.

International Consequences of National Planning, by David Mitrany.

The Virgin and the Dragon (Browning), by William C. DeVane.

Our Declining Mineral Reserves, by William O. Hotchkiss.

Teachers of Today, September-November (Religious Education Press, 6d.).

Short articles by experts on the Teacher's part in 'The Battle of Peace', 'Youth and the Cinema', 'Membership Training in Presbyterian Churches', 'Acting out a Lesson', 'Youth and Drink', etc., etc.

The Journal of Politics (University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida, \$3.50 per annum) is a quarterly review that takes the large view of its subject. In the May number, for instance, there are articles on 'Political Relativism', the 'Inter-American Security System and the United Nations', and 'Sectional Politics and the Rise of Judicial Supremacy', together with a symposium on recent developments in the British Commonwealth of Nations.

d a

70;

), by

ema',
, etc.

terly
ticles
and
ecent